

*Bulletin of the
Association of American Colleges*

Edited by
GUY E. SNAVELY
Executive Director of the Association

LAURA-MAY SPAIN
Editorial Assistant

VOLUME XXVI, 1940

Published by the
Association of American Colleges
N. Queen St. and McGovern Ave., Lancaster, Pa.

Editorial Offices
19 West 44th Street, New York, N. Y.

March, May, November, December

Annual Subscription, \$3.00

7444

10

Association of American Colleges Bulletin

VOLUME XXVI

MARCH, 1940

NUMBER 1

Edited by

GUY E. SNAVELY

Executive Director of the Association

LAURA-MAY SPAIN

Editorial Assistant

Published by the

Association of American Colleges

N. Queen St. and McGovern Ave., Lancaster, Pa.

Editorial Offices

19 West 44th Street, New York, N. Y.

March, May, November, December

Annual Subscription, \$3.00

Entered as second class matter, March 15, 1926, at the post office at
Lancaster, Pa., under the Act of March 3, 1879.

Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section
1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized May 13, 1922.

OFFICERS OF THE ASSOCIATION FOR 1940-41

President: Edward V. Stanford, President of Villanova College.

Vice-President: Remsen D. Bird, President of Occidental College.

Treasurer: LeRoy E. Kimball, Comptroller of New York University.

Executive Director: Guy E. Snively.

—*Executive Director Emeritus:* Robert L. Kelly, Claremont, California.

Board of Directors: (Additional Members) Conrad Bergendoff, President of Augustana College; James B. Conant, President of Harvard University; Charles E. Diehl, President of Southwestern; Mildred H. McAfee, President of Wellesley College.

STANDING COMMISSIONS AND COMMITTEES

COMMISSION ON ACADEMIC FREEDOM AND ACADEMIC TENURE: President W. P. Tolley, Allegheny College, *Chairman*; Chancellor S. P. Capen, The University of Buffalo; President William C. Dennis, Earlham College; President Edward A. Fitzpatrick, Mount Mary College; President Meta Glass, Sweet Briar College; President E. J. Jaqua, Scripps College; President R. A. Kent, University of Louisville; Dean E. H. Kraus, University of Michigan; President Laurens H. Seelye, St. Lawrence University; Dean Carl A. Wittke, Oberlin College.

COMMISSION ON THE ARTS: R. H. Fitzgerald, Provost of University of Pittsburgh, *Chairman*; President T. J. Davies, Colorado College; President E. M. Gwathmey, Converse College; President D. M. Keezer, Reed College; President F. P. Keppel, The Carnegie Corporation; J. Fredrick Larson, Dartmouth College; Barclay Leathem, Western Reserve University; President J. H. Reynolds, Hendrix College; Dean Gilmore D. Clarke, United States Commission on Fine Arts; Agnes Rindge, Vassar College.

COMMISSION ON TEACHER EDUCATION: President Harry M. Gage, Coe College, *Chairman*; President Lucia R. Briggs, Milwaukee-Downer College; Dean Margaret T. Corwin, New Jersey College for Women; President C. K. Edmunds, Pomona College; President Fred Engelhardt, University of New Hampshire; President Fred G. Holloway, Western Maryland College; President L. H. Hubbard, Texas State College for Women; President W. L. Lingle, Davidson College; President P. C. Nash, University of Toledo.

COMMISSION ON PUBLIC RELATIONS: President Francis P. Gaines, Washington and Lee University, *Chairman*; Vice-President J. W. Lowes, Harvard University; Doctor George Johnson, The Catholic University of America; President Daniel L. Marsh, Boston University; President John L. Seaton, Albion College; President W. E. Weld, Wells College.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON FRATERNITIES: President Dixon Ryan Fox, Union College, *Chairman*; President Thomas N. Barrows, Lawrence College; Comptroller LeRoy E. Kimball, New York University; President Alexander Ruthven, University of Michigan; President Henry M. Wriston, Brown University.

COMMITTEE ON INSURANCE AND ANNUITIES: President W. E. Weld, Wells College, *Chairman*; President Charles A. Anderson, Tusculum College; Controller J. C. Christensen, University of Michigan; President C. H. Marvin, George Washington University; Dean Francis L. Meade, Niagara University; Vice-President Paul H. Musser, University of Pennsylvania; Rainard B. Robbins, Vice-President and Secretary of the Teachers Insurance and Annuity Association of America.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLICATIONS: The President, *ex officio*, the Vice-President, *ex officio*, The Executive Director, *ex officio*.

REPRESENTATIVES ON AMERICAN COUNCIL ON EDUCATION: Chancellor S. P. Capen, The University of Buffalo (one year); President Francis P. Gaines, Washington and Lee University (two years); President David A. Robertson, Goucher College (three years).

THE ASSOCIATION BULLETIN

The BULLETIN is published four times a year—in March, May, November and December. Its emphasis is on description and exposition, not primarily on criticism or controversy. The March issue regularly carries the Proceedings of the Annual Meeting of the Association. Leaders in the college world contribute to every issue.

Annual Subscription Rates: Regular, \$3.00; to members of Association colleges special rates are offered: individual subscriptions, \$1.00; ten or more club subscriptions, mailed in one package for distribution at the college, 50 cents each. Address the Association of American Colleges, 19 West 44th Street, New York, N. Y.

CONTENTS

	PAGE
The Annual Meeting	5
The World War and the Future World Order, <i>His Excellency, Doctor Hu Shih</i>	6
Union Now, <i>Clarence K. Streit</i>	15
The War and The Campus, <i>Stephen Duggan</i>	20
A FREE COLLEGE IN A FREE STATE	
Religious Freedom, <i>Charles E. Diehl</i>	25
Freedom as Affected by Finances, <i>J. W. Lowes</i>	39
Freedom in Legislation, <i>Fred Pierce Corson</i>	45
THE RELATIONS BETWEEN THE LIBERAL ARTS COLLEGE, THE JUNIOR COLLEGE AND THE PROFESSIONAL SCHOOL	
<i>James P. Baxter</i> —The Liberal Arts College	56
<i>Byron S. Hollinshead</i> —The Junior College	64
Relationship of College to Medical Education, <i>Willard C. Rappleye, M.D.</i>	73
THE ACTIVITIES OF THE YEAR	
Report of the President, <i>Meta Glass</i>	81
Report of the Executive Director, <i>Guy E. Snavely</i>	85
Report of the Board of Directors	88
Report of the Treasurer, <i>LeRoy E. Kimball</i>	91
Report of the Commission on School and College Relations of the Progressive Education Association, <i>Herbert E. Hawkes</i>	95
Report of the Commission on Academic Freedom and Academic Tenure, <i>Henry M. Wriston</i>	99
Report of the Commission on the Arts, <i>R. H. Fitzgerald</i>	108
Report of the Commission on Public Relations, <i>Francis P. Gaines</i>	110
Report of the Commission on Teacher Education, <i>Harry M. Gage</i>	114
Report of the Committee on Insurance and Annuities, <i>William E. Weld</i>	120
THE OFFICIAL RECORDS	
Minutes of the Twenty-Sixth Annual Meeting	126
Members of the Association	133
Constitution and By-Laws	149
Former Presidents of the Association	153
—	
Editorial Notes	154
Among the Colleges	161
Wesleyan Print Collection	166
New College Presidents	168
Additions to the Office Library	170

THE ANNUAL MEETING

THE Twenty-Sixth Annual Meeting of the Association was held at the Benjamin Franklin Hotel in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, January 11-12, 1940. The general topic was "A Free College in a Free State." Among the excellent addresses delivered was the notable one given by His Excellency, Doctor Hu Shih, Ambassador of the Chinese Republic. These speeches are all included in this issue of the BULLETIN.

The reports of the Commissions were more interesting than usual. Action was taken on the report of the Commission on Academic Freedom and Academic Tenure, while action was deferred on the report of the Committee on Insurance and Annuities which referred to the relation of the colleges to the Social Security Act. These reports are found herein in full.

At noon on Friday, January 12th the newly elected Board of Directors held its first meeting. It voted to hold the next Annual Meeting: JANUARY 9-10, 1941, PASADENA, CALIFORNIA.

THE WORLD WAR AND THE FUTURE WORLD ORDER

HIS EXCELLENCY DOCTOR HU SHIH

AMBASSADOR OF THE CHINESE REPUBLIC

I

THE second World War was started, not on September 3, 1939, but over eight years ago in Mukden, China, when on September 18, 1931, Japan's armies began her invasion in China. On that memorable evening, a section of a railway was destroyed and the Japanese Army shelled the Chinese city of Mukden and occupied it. Thus began the Sino-Japanese Conflict which has lasted eight years and four months to date. And thus has begun the second World War which must include the Italian-Ethiopian War of 1935, the Spanish War of 1936-1939, the "extinguishment of Austria, Czechoslovakia, Albania, as well as the Wars that are now raging in Europe.

For on that memorable evening, it was not only a section of a railway that was destroyed, nor merely a city that was shelled. It was the New World Order that was attacked and destroyed—the New World Order which we in those days of Wilsonian idealism had dreamed of and which had cost 200 billion dollars and eight and a half million human lives to bring into being.

That New World Order did not consist of the League of Nations alone, but stood on the basis of a host of more or less idealistic international agreements and understandings, including the Covenant of the League of Nations, the Statute of the Permanent Court of International Justice, the Nine-Power Treaty and other treaties of the Washington Conference, the Locarno Pacts and the Kellogg-Briand Pact of Paris. By means of these overlapping and interlocking international agreements, the post-War World Order was able to embrace almost the whole civilized world including the United States, which, though not a member of the League of Nations, is a signatory to the Nine-Power Treaty, the Naval Disarmament Treaties and the Kellogg-Briand Pact of Paris.

It was this New World Order that was attacked on the night of September 18, 1931. For the Japanese invasion in Manchuria

was the most severe and important test of the strength and stability of this international Order. Article 10 of the League Covenant, for example, stipulates: "The Members of the League undertake to respect and preserve as against aggression the territorial integrity and existing political independence of all Members of the League." Article I of the Nine-Power Treaty says: "The contracting Powers . . . agree to respect the sovereignty, the independence, and the territorial and administrative integrity of China, and to provide the fullest and most unembarrassed opportunity to China to develop and maintain for herself an effective and stable government." And the Pact of Paris says: "The High Contracting Parties solemnly declare, in the names of their respective peoples, that they condemn recourse to war for the solution of international controversies and renounce it as an instrument of national policy in their relations with one another." All these and many other chief supports of the New World Order were now subjected to the test of a real, unprovoked and undisguised aggression by Japan in China.

China naturally appealed to the League of Nations and to the signatories and adherents of the Nine-Power Treaty. What happened during those memorable years of 1931 and 1932, when the League of Nations attempted to mediate for a peaceful settlement of the Sino-Japanese dispute, need not be retold here. Suffice it to say that the world at that time was not prepared to support that international order by curbing the aggressions of Japan. The League pronounced a judgment and proposed a settlement which was tantamount to a surrender to Japan's wishes. Yet Japan still refused to accept the settlement and withdrew from the League in March, 1933. Nothing was done by the supporters of Collective Security.

It is reported that when Japan left the League, a German Cabinet Minister said to the Japanese representative at Geneva: "We don't think you are right, but we thank you for your example." The example of Japan has since been successfully followed by other aggressor states in many other parts of the world.

The whole structure of post-War World Order under which the nations, the great and strong as well as the small and weak,

lived in comparative peace for more than a decade, rapidly broke down, and is now almost completely scrapped. The failure of the New World Order to support its own principles during the early stage of the Sino-Japanese dispute not only doomed it to ultimate downfall, but also greatly encouraged and tempted the other discontented and militaristically prepared countries to go on with more daring and more far-reaching aggressions until the whole world is plunged into a stupendous conflagration.

It is, therefore, historically accurate to say that the second World War was started eight years ago in Mukden, China. The first shots of September 18, 1931, now known to have been planned and executed by two young officers of the Japanese army will surely be acknowledged by history as the first shots of the world conflagration.

II

Two years ago, or even half a year ago, if I should have told the world that China was fighting the first battles of a world war, very few people would have believed it. But the recent developments in Europe have brought into prominence the striking similarity between China's War of Resistance and the wars being fought by the European democracies against aggression. Such a similarity should make the outside world better understand that the thirty months of China's heroic resistance to Japanese aggression is truly an integral part of the World War, the end of which no one can yet envisage.

The New World War, whether in its China phase or in its European phases, has one thing in common—namely, that everywhere the war has been forced on a peace-loving and militarily unprepared nation by an unscrupulous and militaristic aggressor-state.

You may remember that in March, 1935, the British Government, in a White Paper, confessed that, during the years past, "there has been a steady decline in the effective strength of our armament by sea and land," and "in the air, we virtually disarmed ourselves in 1919, and, subsequently, from time to time postponed attainment of the minimum air strength regarded as necessary to our security in the face of air developments on the Continent." In the same document, the British Government admitted: "We . . . are approaching a point when we are not

possessed of the necessary means of defending ourselves against an aggressor."

If Great Britain, one of the few most powerful countries in the world, had to confess that she was "not possessed of the necessary means of defending herself against an aggressor," it should not be difficult for the world to understand that China, where the whole cultural tradition of at least twenty centuries had condemned military conquest and despised the profession of the soldier, was caught in 1931 entirely unprepared to defend herself against the premeditated aggression of Japan. China had no navy, no air force worth speaking of, and no modern war equipment for her army. Naturally she wanted to avoid a war against an invader who happened to be one of the greatest military and naval powers in the world. Naturally and quite sincerely, she, for six long years, adopted a policy of appeasement toward Japan in the face of the most unbearable insults, indignities and humiliations!

But after six years of patient but unsuccessfully appeasement, she was forced at last to take up the fight in July, 1937, just as Great Britain, after eight long years of a consistent policy to appease the aggressor, was forced to take up the challenge on September 3, 1939.

These bitter and tragic happenings in Europe should be sufficient to make China's friends better understand and more fully appreciate the desperate but heroic fight we have been making during these terrible years. We are fighting the same war as Poland, and Great Britain and France, and Finland have been fighting. We are fighting and will continue to fight on simply because we are determined not to suffer the fate of Abyssinia, Austria, Albania and Czechoslovakia. We are fighting because we want to be free and independent.

My Government and my people have repeatedly declared that we are fighting to resist aggression, to preserve our sovereignty and our territorial and administrative integrity, and to uphold the sanctity of international treaties, especially the Nine-Power Treaty, the League Covenant and the Pact of Paris. These are our war aims and these are our peace aims.

These are not mere high-sounding words from a suffering nation appealing for the sympathy of the larger world. No,

they are real and concrete issues. And all of you who have followed the stirring events in Europe during the past fifteen months, can easily understand that they are real and concrete issues.

On the night of September 27, 1938—the night before Hitler's invitation to Munich—I was in London and heard Prime Minister Chamberlain's broadcast to the British Empire and to the world, in which he said:

However much we may sympathize with a small nation confronted by a big powerful neighbor, we cannot in all circumstances undertake to involve the British Empire in a war simply on her account.

If we have to fight, it must be on larger issues than that.

I am myself a man of peace to the depth of my soul. Armed conflict between nations is a nightmare to me. But if I were convinced that any nation had made up its mind to dominate the world by fear of its force, I should feel it must be resisted.

On that evening, and in the subsequent weeks, Mr. Chamberlain was still trying to separate the fate of a small nation from the "larger issues." And the Peace of Munich seems to have been made on the assumption that violation of the territorial integrity of a small nation did not involve the "larger issues."

What has happened since Munich clearly demonstrates that the fate of a small nation in the claws of a powerful and aggressive neighbor is simply a concrete embodiment of the "larger issues." Indeed, there are no "larger issues" apart from these concrete cases.

Great Britain and France are now fighting—technically because they have given a pledge to Poland to the effect that, in case of Poland's national independence being violated, if Poland should resist such violation with her armed forces, Britain and France would come to her assistance. When Poland was invaded and she chose to fight, Great Britain and France declared war on Germany.

This was clearly also a case of "a small nation confronted by a big powerful neighbor." But, by this time, Great Britain and France had realized that they were fighting for the "larger issues" of which the invasion of Poland was merely a concrete illustration. Thus Premier Deladier said on September 3:

We are fighting to defend our land, our homes, our liberty. . . . The cause of France is the cause of justice. It is the cause of all peaceful and free nations.

Thus King George VI said on the same day:

We have been forced into a conflict, for we are called, with our allies, to meet the challenge of a principle which, if it were to prevail, would be fatal to any civilized order in the world.

It is a principle which permits a state in the selfish pursuit of power to disregard its treaties and its solemn pledges, which sanctions the use of force or threat of force against the sovereignty and independence of other states.

And Prime Minister Chamberlain said on November 26, 1939:

Our war aim can be stated very shortly. It is to defeat our enemy; and by that I mean not merely the defeat of the enemy's military forces. I mean the defeat of that aggressive, bullying mentality which seeks continually to dominate other peoples by force, which finds brutal satisfaction in the persecution and torture of inoffensive citizens, and which, in the name of the state, justifies the repudiation of its own pledged word whenever it finds it convenient.

Why should I trouble you with all these high-sounding generalities expressed by the heads of the governments of the warring nations? I want to tell my friends that, when I read them, they are no mere high-sounding generalities, but concrete descriptions of real issues which are so real and so compelling that millions of men are actually fighting and dying for them. I can feel their reality, because millions of my own people have for thirty months been fighting and dying "to defend our land, our homes and our liberty," and to resist the establishment of the principle which permits a state in its selfish pursuit of power, to disregard its treaties and which "sanctions the use of force or threat of force against the sovereignty and independence of other states."

Such, then, are the common features which characterize the wars now raging in the Far East and in Europe as different aspects of one and the same New World War. They are all the results of the breakdown of the World Order. They are all forced

on the peaceful and militarily unprepared peoples by the aggressor-states whose appetite for aggression grows with every new success. China and the warring democracies of Europe have the same war aims which include the defeat of aggression and the defeat of the philosophy of aggression. And they probably have the same peace aims which at least include the reestablishment, reorganizing and reinforcement of the World Order that shall make the recurrence of such a world conflagration impossible.

III

What kind of a New World Order do we wish to set up when the present World War is over? Shall we scrap the present international frame-work as hopelessly unworkable and ineffective and try to create an entirely new World Order? Or shall we try to revise and reform the old international order by enlarging it and implementing it?

Mr. Clarence K. Streit, whom you heard last night and whose book *Union Now* many of us have read, thinks that we should begin anew with a "Union" of fifteen democracies. His book is the expression of the sincere and earnest thinking of an idealist and is already becoming an article of faith to many internationally minded persons on both sides of the Atlantic.

Of the 15 democracies named by Mr. Streit, seven (Australia, Canada, Finland, France, New Zealand, Union of South Africa and the United Kingdom) are now engaged in the World War. It is not improbable that, before the War is over, more of these democracies may be involved in it. It would be a wonderful gain for mankind if such a union of the democracies as Mr. Streit has dreamed of could be born of the agony and anguish of the World War. A union, or even a "league," of the American Commonwealth, the British Commonwealth of Nations and the Democracies of Western Europe would be truly the most powerful bulwark for the peace and order of the world.

It seems to me, however, that whatever form the future World Order may take, it must fulfill one pre-condition for its success: it must have power to enforce its own law and order.

You will recall that the present League of Nations historically grew out of the movement for a "League to Enforce Peace" started twenty-five years ago in this historic city of Philadelphia

by one of your members—Mr. Hamilton Holt, now President of Rollins College, Winter Park, Florida. If I understood it correctly, that movement placed great emphasis on the importance of the “enforcement” of peace which was embodied in Article III of the Proposals of the League to Enforce Peace: “The signatory powers shall jointly use forthwith both their economic and military forces against any one of their number that goes to war, or commits acts of hostility, against another of the signatories before any question arising shall be submitted (to a judicial tribunal for hearing and judgment, or to a council of conciliation for hearing, consideration and recommendation).”

But when the war-weary world came together to establish a League of Nations, the idea of “enforcement” (or sanctions) was there; but it was deliberately made so difficult that it was well-nigh impossible. The result was an international government that had no effective means to enforce the peace and order of the world.

In a remarkable address of last October, the new British Ambassador to the United States, the Marquess of Lothian, said:

One of the mistakes the democracies made after the last war was to think that peace would come in the main through disarmament. Disarmament on a large scale, of course, is necessary. But peace comes from there being overwhelming power behind law—as you found when you had to deal with gangsters within your boundaries.

I think Lord Lothian has drawn the most important lesson that can be drawn from the recent history of international relationship and government. The future League or Union of Nations must be a “League to *Enforce* Peace.” An international government that cannot implement its own laws is illusory and unreal.

In order to make this fundamental idea workable, a few guiding principles seem to be quite necessary:

First, the future World Order must be built up on the basis, not of vague generalities and abstractions, but of definite and precise commitments by the states. The Earl of Lytton once said: “It is broadly true, however paradoxical it may sound, that the greater and the more precise are the commitments of a

country, the less is its liability to be drawn into war." He cited the Monroe Doctrine as a case of a definite commitment. We may cite the British and French pledges to Poland, Rumania and Greece in 1939 as examples of definite commitments. If the aggressor-states of 1931, 1935, 1937 and 1938 had been warned of some such definite and precise commitments for the preservation and enforcement of general peace, the World War, in all probability would have never happened.

Second, the old idea of formal equality among the nations must be greatly qualified and supplemented by the principle of Graded Responsibility according to the ability, strength and geographical or strategic position of the states. It is absurd, for instance, to expect Denmark, to undertake the same responsibility as Great Britain in a given international situation. Why not therefore frankly recognize the fact and apportion the responsibilities according to their respective abilities?

Third, a necessary corollary from the idea of graded responsibility is the principle of Regional Leadership and Cooperation. The fatal mistake of the League of Nations is that it could not effectively function even as a League of Europe. Its pretensions as a World Government were largely responsible for the failure to set up regional machineries to deal effectively with important local conflicts. The historic part played by the United States in the Western Hemisphere best illustrates what I mean by the idea of Regional Leadership and Cooperation.

A world state of regional unions, federations and confederacies with definite and precise commitments according to the graded responsibilities of the states or groups of states—this is the formula which I wish to recommend to the serious reflection of all dreamers of a better and more workable world order.

UNION NOW

CLARENCE K. STREIT

AUTHOR, Union Now

TO avoid a bad peace we are increasing our armaments and remain pledged to send our boys overseas—to the jungles of Latin America. But we cannot avoid a bad peace simply by fighting or winning a war. We learned that twenty years ago. We have not yet learned that the only way we can avoid a bad peace is by organizing effective inter-state government in the world. It is high time we turned from the negative to the constructive and begin studying this problem of organizing the government on which peace depends.

There are but two ways, at bottom, to organize inter-state government, for there are but two basic units—the state of the individual citizen. The former produces such systems as international law, diplomacy, alliances; it reached its highest form in the League of Nations and can be called the league system. The latter leads to Federal Union. We must choose, then, between organizing peace and government on a league or a union basis. We shall make a wiser choice by going back first to our own history for enlightenment.

Just as we sought to make the world safe for democracy in 1919 by organizing the victorious democracies as a League of Nations, we sought, after our first war for democracy, to keep the Atlantic coast safe for individual freedom by organizing the Thirteen democracies under the Articles of Confederation as a league—the League of Friendship. Our fathers assumed then, as we did in 1919, that to keep individual freedom they must keep their own democracy free from the others. And so they organized the League of Friendship just as we did the League of Nations, not to secure individual rights but state rights—to secure each member state the right to have its own army, money, tariff. They organized the kind of government that leagues always are—a government of states, by states, for states.

The results were much the same as with the League of Nations. There were tariff wars between the states, depression, unemployment, heavy indebtedness, attempts to improve matters by money

magic and by giving more power to the state governments—when the money of Rhode Island grew worthless the government sought to coerce people into accepting it. Philadelphia boycotted New Jersey money, Boston boycotted Rhode Island grain. Eleven territorial disputes arose among the thirteen states, and some of these threatened to lead to war. Congress under the League became the laughing-stock Geneva did; it could rarely muster even a quorum. The situation, in short, was such that people began to say the war for democracy had been a mistake. But that time they didn't quit the struggle for it.

Instead they got together in Philadelphia, applied again the principles of the Declaration of Independence, abolished the League form of government that had become destructive of individual life, liberty and happiness, and instituted new government—invented the Federal Union system. In so doing, they simply made their inter-state government a democracy—a government of, by and for the people, like that of every state in it, instead of a government of, by and for states, as in the league system.

By organizing a government of people instead of states they got away from the inability of leagues to enforce law. League law can only be enforced against armed, organized states—by war; Union law, being enforced against individuals, avoids this danger. By organizing government by the people instead of states they overcame the inability of leagues to get agreement in time to be of service. By organizing government for the people instead of for the states they got away from the basic cause of the failure of all leagues. They divided the powers of government between the states and the Union government with a view to gaining freedom thereby for themselves. They left all these powers where they were except five which they shifted to the Union government. They thus gained for themselves and us (1) our powerful Union defense forces; (2) our rich Union free trade market; (3) our stable Union money; (4) our cheap Union postal system and (5) our highly privileged Union citizenship. Since each citizen had precisely the same control over the Union as over the state government—one vote—no citizen of any state lost any power or rights in making all these tremendous gains.

The results? An "astounding success." Individual freedom flourished, the eleven disputes were settled, hard times gave way

to prosperity, foreign trade quadrupled in ten years, money grew stable and the Union which began with a debt of \$75,000,000 was soon paying off a surplus after buying Louisiana, Florida, paying for the War of 1812.

How can we account for this remarkable success except by attributing it to the change in the form of government? The same people lived under the League as under the Union, they had the same leadership and the same rich resources; the only thing that changed was the form of government, from League to Union.

And so we Inter-democracy Federal Unionists propose that we follow this old American example now. We can hardly blame the Europeans alone for the present situation since it was we who got them to adopt the league system which we had already proved would lead to these troubles—and then we carried the league system to its extreme by carrying its doctrine of states' rights to the peak of isolationism and neutralism.

If we are to return to our own basic principles of men's rights and Union, we must recognize that we cannot organize all the world at once as a Federal Union. We must leave out at the start the dictatorships that have organized the people for the sake of the state and also the immature democracies, and begin with the smallest group of experienced democracies that will give us enough power to secure peace without war, by sheer overwhelming preponderance of power. We suggest as founders these 15: the United States of America, Canada, Ireland, United Kingdom, France, Switzerland, Belgium, Holland, Denmark, Norway, Sweden, Finland, Union of South Africa, Australia, New Zealand. This group has given the world what freedom it has. No two of these 15 have fought a war between them in the past 100 years. United, they would own half the earth, rule all its oceans, govern nearly half mankind and control more than 60 per cent of nearly every essential of peace and war. They have the power to make half the world at once safe for democracy without war, by simply showing the commonsense the thirteen showed in 1787 and organizing themselves as a Union.

Their Union is not proposed as a wartime bloc or closed corporation, but as a nucleus designed to grow peacefully and gradually into a universal world government by the admission into it of all other democracies now or to come that guarantee their citizens the

basic individual rights for which this Union would be made. This provision would give the people under dictatorship a tremendous stimulus to overthrow it and join The Union.

How to get this Union established? That depends on how long it takes the majority of Americans to decide to lead the world in this direction. We cannot foretell now what the situation will be then, for events are moving swiftly and surprisingly in this war. It may be that by the time we have decided to try to organize peace this time on the Union instead of the League basis, there may be a truce, a draw, an Allied victory, or we may have been drawn into the war ourselves by the nationalist philosophy that now dominates us, or it may be too late: A Hitler triumph may have made Federal Union impossible not only in the world but perhaps also in America. Until we have decided to cross the Rubicon it is pointless to speculate on how to bridge the Tiber.

The immediate task is to educate the public to the Union idea. The Union proposal is much further advanced than was the League idea in 1915—a year after the war began that ended in a League. The book, *Union Now*, proposing it was first published by Harpers six months before the war began, and then in England, France, Sweden, all before the war. In each of the three big democracies people have already spontaneously and independently organized to promote this Union. The American organization, called Inter-democracy Federal Unionists, has headquarters at 445 West 23rd Street, New York City; it has members in all but three states and publishes a monthly bulletin.

We are facing now an old issue in our history—whether the way to save our democracy is to keep it where it is or to go on with it. Every time the American people have chosen the greater instead of the littler side: not only in 1789 but in the Louisiana purchase, the Monroe Doctrine, the Mexican war, the Civil war, the Spanish war, the World war. Our generation began by taking our principles to their peak, winning one of the most complete victories in history. But when all but one of the autocracies had toppled over and democracies had started rising in their ruins, when we had the world in our hands, we quit the job, decided we had grown strong enough to be safe and free all by ourselves no matter what happened to the rest of the world. We have practised this policy for twenty years, and as a result we are the first American generation

in history to see the American standard of living go down and democracy retreat all along the line. Is our history as a people to be that of some of our prominent families—to grow soft in three or four generations and fizzle out?

Just as our oceans have protected us, a shell protects an embryo chick only until it develops the power to break through the shell; if it fails then to break through and step out into the world the shell suddenly changes from a safeguard to an enemy and smothers the chick to death.

We face a greater danger to all that America means than ever before. Napoleon was crusading for, rather than against, our basic principles; and even the Kaiser was not crusading against them as Hitler is, nor did he begin as Hitler does with a 90-billion Mark war machine. That figure represents three-fourths of the cost of the whole World War to Germany.

If we are to save our great American heritage, we must remember that individual freedom depends on individual responsibility. We must prove that we, too, have the courage and vision and willingness to work and risk for liberty and Union that was shown by all the generations of Americans before us who gave us liberty and Union.

THE WAR AND THE CAMPUS

STEPHEN DUGGAN

DIRECTOR, INSTITUTE OF INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION

WAR and education in any true sense of this much abused term, are almost mutually exclusive. War is a destructive activity, education a constructive activity. War devotes itself exclusively to material objectives, education primarily to spiritual values. War stimulates on the whole the evil side of human nature; education the good side of human nature. War is based upon deception of enemies always, of friends sometimes. Education is based upon the search for, and diffusion of, truth. War degrades the tenets of the Christian religion. Education exalts the tenets of the Christian religion. War meets with the almost universal condemnation of mankind; education with the almost universal approval of mankind. Men pray for the day when war will disappear from the earth; they also pray for the day when education will spread throughout the earth.

It would be difficult to overemphasize the influence that this war has already had upon education and in all probability will continue to have during the year 1940. It has disrupted education in the belligerent countries and has profoundly influenced the attitude towards education in the non-belligerent countries. I shall confine my few remarks to higher education.

Consider the effects of the opening of war upon the college campus. Young men are conscripted for the war. They are cheated of their just due, their fullest self-development. It will be conceded, I am sure, that the years spent in the trenches are lost years, lost forever. The future careers of these college conscripts or volunteers are frequently ruined, for they are the years planned to provide the elements of knowledge necessary in the competition among men for place in their chosen field. These "legionnaires" return from the trenches to a disrupted, sometimes a ruined world. They return often ill, sometimes disillusioned and discouraged, frequently with difficulty making a new orientation. And what of those left behind on the campus, the unconscribed? Certainly they are better off than the others. But they must often pursue their studies in a desiccated environ-

ment with inadequate materials and resources, with changed curricula and shortened courses. It may be that their best teachers have been called away in the service of Mars—like themselves.

Is this too gloomy a picture? Let me hastily review some of the conditions existing to-day. In the countries where mass fighting has taken place, China and Poland, higher education has been almost extinguished. Every Chinese university has been destroyed, only foreign universities carrying on. The Chinese professors and students have fled to the West with nothing but the clothes on their backs, to live perilously and patriotically in makeshift colleges. In Poland the University of Krakow, older by more than twenty years than any German university, has been closed and its able professors sent to a concentration camp. Warsaw is carrying on upon a starved diet. Prague has been shut up because of the alleged contumacious conduct of its students.

But what of the belligerent countries not yet engaged in land warfare? When the war started, the University of London closed and most of its thousands of students dispersed among other universities. London University's students are mostly poor students and many could not afford the change and dropped out altogether. Nevertheless, the British have retained in their universities as many students as possible to provide physicians, dentists, bacteriologists and other contributors to war service. After the World War, the British government established the University Grants Committee to distribute equitably among the universities the large sum of over £2,000,000 it provides for that purpose. The government has already notified the universities that though it will distribute the usual sum this year it cannot guarantee that it will do so thereafter. In war, education is always one of the first of the human activities to suffer—the darkness hates the light. With the enormous burden of debt caused by this war which must be paid, it is a question whether the standard of living existing before the war can be restored for a generation.

In France as soon as the war commenced the University of Strasbourg closed its doors and its students were scattered among other universities, all of which are carrying on upon a reduced scale. The great Bibliothèque Nationale has been closed. So

have most of the museums. In Germany it suffices to say that of the twenty-three universities only five remain open. Most male students are at the front and women students are not wanted.

Bad as these material evils are, in some of the countries spiritual evils are worse. The attitude toward life of any country determines the character of its educational system. All the totalitarian countries teach that the State is the supreme end of existence and that the individual exists solely for the State. The very word "totalitarian" implies that the State is to decide in *all* things: what its young shall be taught, what its people shall read in the newspapers and hear over the radio, whether its authors shall be permitted to publish books containing views not favored by the State, or cinema companies be allowed to show pictures disliked by the State or private organizations to carry on activities distrusted by the State. The greatest totalitarian State, Germany, has continued to emphasize the doctrines of Aryan superiority and race solidarity. Aryan superiority and race solidarity mean the exclusion from Germany of all alien elements like the Jews who are now excluded from all education except what they can supply themselves. Moreover, Nazi biology regards women chiefly as breeders of men to serve the State. Hence their education beyond that of the Gymnasium continues to be looked upon with disfavor. Recent regulations of the Ministry of Education provide that the Nazi party alone will determine who may attend the universities. The regulations also reduce the length of vacation, insist upon the importance of practical and technical subjects and in every way emphasize that university education is not to be determined by the preference of the university leaders and administrators but by the will of the State.

The German view of the place of education in the State has had a profound influence upon education in every other totalitarian country with modifications determined by conditions. Japan does not hold to Aryan supremacy but she does, as do all other totalitarian countries, hold to race solidarity. Anti-liberal views on subject matter, old fashioned methods of teaching and rigid discipline have everywhere accompanied the appearance of totalitarianism in any country. This is now true of Spain and of the former Czechoslovakia. Moreover, wherever German influence has extended, as in Italy and Japan, anti-Semitism has usually

resulted in the expulsion of Jewish teachers and scholars. It will be a long time, before Jews will regain the place of eminence they have hitherto held in the intellectual life of totalitarian countries. In Italy the Grand Council of Fascism has promulgated a new Charter of the School providing for a complete reorganization of education. Compulsory school attendance begins at four and continues to fourteen. The practical subjects are to receive increased attention and the academic subjects less. The fact that education is exclusively for purposes of the State is everywhere emphasized. The implementation of the Charter of the School was postponed because of the war. In Soviet Russia, the chief emphasis now is upon nationalism and patriotism instead of socialism as necessary for the defense of the "Socialist Fatherland." In Japan hundreds of teachers and students were formerly put in prison for holding "dangerous thoughts" but more recently an attempt has been made to deal with these people in another way, by creating a Bureau of Thought Supervision—an official national Dies Committee attached to the Department of Education.

The democracies have not remained unaffected by the events of the past year and especially by the war. In every democratic country there has been a resurgence of faith in democratic institutions and a determination to safeguard them. This attitude has been reflected in the school, using that term in its widest meaning. Criticism of most aspects of the school, its organization and administration, its curriculum, discipline, examinations, has been very prevalent. The demand everywhere is that the school must be made a more efficient instrument for preparation for life in a democracy. The ideal everywhere emphasized is the individual student as a future citizen having definite duties toward the State. But the individual as a person, with all the noble elements inherent in that term, is exalted.

And now a final word about ourselves. We are participating in the democratic revival. The smart young writers who, down to the appearance of Hitler, directed their irony and sarcasm at the weaknesses of democracy—and there are undoubted weaknesses—have learned that every form of political organization has weaknesses and that those of democracy are probably least injurious to human welfare. The fine young idealists of our

campus who have seen the Soviet Union transformed from an agency for peace to one of lying imperialism will unquestionably rally to the support of our democratic institutions leaving but a few, chloroformed by communist propaganda, to take orders from a foreign capital. The youth of our campus want us to stay out of this war. They are right. We must stay out unless our existence and freedom are in danger. But we have principles and we want those principles maintained. Admitting that power politics is not without a place in this war, nevertheless the Allied powers stand for our way of life; they are fighting for the things we hold dear. A victory for their enemy would mean the disappearance of those things. As a former member of the campus, I pray for an Allied victory.

RELIGIOUS FREEDOM

CHARLES E. DIEHL

PRESIDENT, SOUTHWESTERN

EVERYBODY believes in religious freedom for himself. He has come to feel that he has an inalienable right to worship God according to the dictates of his conscience, and that none shall make him afraid. Theoretically, also, we believe that this is the right of others who differ from us in our convictions, however difficult we find it at times to live up to this high doctrine. Neither the state nor society has the right to compel or control, whether by legal penalties or by the moral coercion of public opinion, that portion of a man's life and conduct which affects only himself. In the domain of consciousness the individual is sovereign. Freedom of conscience, as John Stuart Mill says in his essay *On Liberty*, is "an indefeasible right," and in theory at least we deny absolutely that a human being is accountable to others for his religious belief. The sole ground upon which the state or society is warranted in interfering with the liberty of action of any of its members is self-protection. The only purpose for which power can be rightfully exercised over any member of a civilized community, against his will, is to prevent harm to others.

We can hardly say that religious freedom is distinctly an American product, but the principle of liberty which obtains here is unique, cutting right across that which the Old World had for all the Christian centuries regarded as axiomatic. The Founding Fathers explicitly set aside all the old-time theories of church and state, which, in varying forms, had held universal sway. There were differing policies of union or of control; of alliance, as of two equal parties; of dictation, now on the part of the church, now on the part of the state; of interference by both with the conscience and faith of the individual. The basic idea of them all assumed the necessity of a vital relation between church and state. This was the accepted idea of European churchmen, theologians, statesmen, jurists and publicists, with hardly an exception, from the time of the Emperor Constantine to that of Thomas Jefferson.

In clear denial of all such theories, this new revolutionary principle declared the complete separation of church from state, and

this pure religious liberty has been characterized by Cobb in his *Rise of Religious Liberty in America*, "as the great gift of America to civilization and the world, having among principles of governmental policy no equal for moral insight, and for recognition both of the dignity of the human soul and the spiritual majesty of the Church of God." Bryce, in his *American Commonwealth*, says, "Of all the differences between the Old World and the New, this is perhaps the most salient."

This great boon of constitutional religious freedom, in which we have been nurtured, which we accept as a matter of course, did not come suddenly or without struggle. The demand for religious freedom was, to be sure, inherent in the spirit of the Protestant Reformation; but it took centuries before this idea had free course among the Christian nations. In the Old World battlefields were drenched with the blood of men fighting and dying for conscience and creed. That was not true in this country, though bigotry, intolerance, persecution and cruelty stained the pages of our early history. In New England there was Puritan exclusiveness; in Virginia there was the "gentlemanly conformity to the Church of England," which was impatient of dissent; in New York, for two short periods, the fanatical folly of Dutch and English governors led to cruelty and oppression. One cannot speak except in apologetic terms of many things which occurred during this period, but the same remark might be made of any period of our history, including that in which we are now living. The fact that the young nation was separated from the old by a wide ocean, that it was composed of peoples of diverse nationalities and of different religious faiths, and that no single group could claim a dominant majority to entitle that group to be considered a national church, made it easier for the Constitutional Convention to refuse to give preference to any creed, and to incorporate into the Federal Constitution the following principles: federal neutrality in all confessional matters; federal guarantee of the free exercise of religious faith to all; complete separation of state and church. Each state was to arrange its own church affairs, but no state religion was ever to be established.

The idea that the civil and the ecclesiastical establishments were vitally connected, with more or less of dependence of one upon the other, was not called in question by the Reformation. It met only

the dissent of the despised Anabaptists and Separatists. This fact makes the attitude of our American exception, Roger Williams, the more striking and significant. More than one hundred years in advance of his time, he denied the entire theory and practice of the past, which he regarded as alike unphilosophical and unchristian. He was a pioneer, this great apostle of spiritual liberty, a voice crying in the wilderness, but he did not hesitate to proclaim a truth, against which the powers of church and state were alike arrayed, nor did he refuse to endure cold and hunger and nakedness, and the loss of friends and home for the sake of this truth. He was a worthy herald of that other prophet, that wise master-builder of democracy, Thomas Jefferson. There were others, of course, whose dominant influence on public opinion regarding the questions of religious liberty and the separation of church and state, entitle them to mention, such as Jonathan Edwards, James Madison and many others, but it was Jefferson who wrote the following words in the Declaration of Independence:

We hold these truths to be self-evident; that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness; that to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed. . . .

Religious freedom was officially established, but much more than this was needed to insure a democracy. It was realized that the success of this experiment in government depended upon the character and the intelligence of the electorate. Washington said, "Promote, therefore, as an object of primary concern the means of education." These Founding Fathers were men of convictions. They opposed sectarian bitterness, but they were united in their recognition of spiritual values. To them God and immortality were not vague, iridescent dreams. Life had meaning. They believed in God the Father Almighty, that He had created all men for precisely the same purpose; namely, to obey Him, to become in character and disposition like Him, in whom all men should trust and to whom all must give account. It was not in the minds of our constitution makers, when they excluded religion from the field of government, that this should be an irreligious people, or that religion was socially unimportant, or that it was one of those

luxuries which could easily be spared. It was not the intention to diminish activity in religion, but, rather, to furnish greater opportunity for its free exercise. They realized that, in the last analysis, states are united not so much by self-interest as by moral ideas, that their foundations are laid, not in the flesh, but in the spirit of men.

In April, 1802, Alexander Hamilton wrote a letter to James A. Bayard, in which he refers to his proposed Christian Constitutional Society, the objects of which were:

- (a) To support the Christian religion.
- (b) To support the Constitution of the United States.

Whether or not he had his tongue in his cheek, I do not know, but he seemed to feel that this is a Christian nation, and that the Christian religion is a part of the common law of the land. The American Sunday was to be safeguarded as the day of instruction and inspiration in order to advance liberty and civilization. He desired to formulate a system of moral and religious education that would be as universal as the right of suffrage. Since people of all nations and races were coming to America and would vote, and since some were Jews and some Gentiles, some Catholics and some Protestants, and all voted, it became necessary that there should be some institution to drill men in morals and religion that would include all Protestants, Catholics and Jews, educating them toward God and duty. He apparently felt the force of the remark of Edmund Burke who said, when this country became a Republic, that the great problem of America would be the education of her rulers, her millions of voters.

Hamilton knew, as every one else knows, that the great principles of right and wrong are not denominational. The Ten Commandments do not belong to any sect. Responsibility to God is not peculiar to any race. The big simplicities are binding upon men as men, and the great verities include all classes and both sexes. The multiplication table is not racial. The axiom that the whole is equal to the sum of the parts is not Catholic or Protestant. Right and wrong hold all races; duty and responsibility are binding upon all men.

Hamilton proposed, therefore, that the Christian Constitutional Society should have teachers whose duty it should be to teach the universal simplicities that belong to men as the sons of God, leav-

ing the particular creed, the form of baptism and sacrifice to parents at home. The public school teaches the essentials of political economy, then the boy goes home to receive instruction in free trade from one father, or protective tariff from another father. The public school need not interfere with the private views of the parent. And Hamilton believed that it was possible to have a Christian Constitutional Society that would drill all the citizens in those things that are fundamental to the Republic. For one hour every Sunday all the families were to flow together to receive instruction in morals and religion as they had reference to the American family and the American school, to American trade and commerce, just as in November all the citizens come together to express their educated judgment upon matters political and economic. It was a great dream. He knew that the great perils of the Republic are ignorance and lawlessness, and he proposed turning this whole land into one vast moral and religious schoolhouse for one day in the week through his Constitutional Christian Society. He felt that it was not enough that the government should provide an army and a navy, should place lighthouses on dangerous coasts, dig the mud out of rivers and build levees, the state must also consider the higher manhood of its citizens. Hamilton was killed before he had time to work out his great conception. Only the first draft of his plan is in existence.

Whatever we may think of Alexander Hamilton, there is no doubt about the sincerity of Washington when he made his official statement on September 17, 1796.

Of all the dispositions and habits which lead to political prosperity, Religion and Morality are indispensable supports. In vain would that man claim the tribute of Patriotism, who should labor to subvert these great pillars of human happiness, these firmest props of the duties of Men and Citizens. The mere Politician, equally with the pious man, ought to respect and cherish them. A volume could not trace all their connexions with private and public felicity. Let it be simply asked, Where is the security for property, for reputation, for life, if the sense of religious obligation desert the oaths, which are the instruments of investigation in Courts of Justice? And let us with caution indulge the supposition that morality can be maintained without religion. Whatever may be

conceded to the influence of refined education on minds of peculiar structure, reason and experience both forbid us to expect that national morality can prevail in exclusion of religious principle.

Unfortunately, Hamilton's suggested plan was not carried out, nor did we take very seriously the statement of Washington. We became engrossed in developing the material resources of the country, and we gradually adopted a different set of values. In 1863, through the passage of the Morrill Act, the government entered the field of higher education in a big way, and the various states vied with each other in providing higher education, as well as primary and secondary education, at public expense. The secularization of education developed with amazing rapidity. In some colleges both professors and students sat in the seat of the scornful. Skepticism and cynicism became the badge of respectability. The religious aim was supplanted by the modern god, efficiency. The emphasis came to be laid upon means rather than ends. We gave ourselves to developing technique. Men were being equipped for scientific, mechanic and agricultural pursuits, rather than for high moral ideals and high moral character. The ever-widening horizon of knowledge, the theory of evolution which was woefully misapplied, the foolish arguments about the conflict between science and religion, the misinterpretation of the Bible and its message, the denominational rivalries and bigotries, the multiplied complexities of modern life, reducing more and more the time which might be given to things eternal—these are only some of the causes for the ebbing moral earnestness of a former day. Science has given us a new universe of indefinite magnitude, and has fostered a questioning spirit, for both of which we are profoundly grateful. However, we soon proudly became sophisticated and self-sufficient. We developed a system of materialistic philosophy, of behavioristic psychology, of dogmatic sociology and of relative ethics. The first article of our creed was changed from "I believe in God" to "I believe in man," and our theme song was Walt Whitman's "Song of Myself," beginning grandiloquently with the line "I celebrate myself, and sing myself," and coming to its climax with:

And I say to mankind, Be not curious about God . . .
I hear and behold God in every object, yet understand
God not in the least,

Nor do I understand who there can be more wondrous than myself.

Thomas Hardy wrote a poem, entitled "The Funeral of God," whom he describes as "One whom we can no longer keep alive." We were fully self-assured. We declaimed about being captains of our souls, masters of our fate, and creators of an ideal commonwealth. Religion was outmoded. In this spirit we bowed God out of His universe, and put man on the throne. God was considered as an elderly partner who had retired from active business, and left affairs in the hands of the enterprising and sophisticated sons of men. We misused our religious freedom. We were within our constitutional rights, for religious freedom implies that we have the right to be irreligious, if we so choose, but this condition is a far cry from the attitude and ideals and spirit of colonial days. It was Daniel Webster who said, "If the people do not become religious, I do not know what is to become of us as a nation." Men forgot that the inscription on the Liberty Bell, "Proclaim liberty throughout all the land to all the inhabitants thereof," was taken from the book of Leviticus.

Another thing we have done, we have misinterpreted and misused both freedom and religion. In the *Macintosh* case, it seems to me that the majority decision of the Supreme Court, which denied citizenship to a man who was following the dictates of his conscience, was a violation of the fundamental doctrine of religious freedom.

Likewise, the action of some states which have forbidden the reading of the Bible in the schools, on the ground that it is a sectarian book, is not only silly, but is contrary to the fundamental principles for which the framers of the Constitution stood. In California there was even litigation over permitting a copy of the King James version of the Bible to be placed in the library. I am not now arguing the question of whether or not a perfunctory reading of the Bible in school would do much, if any, good, as matters now stand, with the qualifications of teachers determined almost entirely by the possession of certain credits, especially credits in educational technique. The point is that the Bible, and particularly the King James version, is one of the world's great classics. It is the greatest English classic. Both Ambassador Bryce and Professor Wm. Lyon Phelps, speaking in Carnegie

Hall, in 1911, at the tercentenary celebration of the King James version, made bold to say that no man of letters ever attained to eminent standing in his profession who had not drunk deeply at this fountain of pure English in that noble translation. Coleridge said, "intense study of the Bible will keep any writer from being *vulgar* in point of style." And Sir Edwin Arnold said, "I owe my education as a writer more to the Bible than to any other one hundred books that could be named." If there is any truth in these statements, may we not question the wisdom of the removal of that English version of the Bible from the curriculum of the primary schools where English is taught, and is there not room for severe arraignment of some of the boards of education of the country for their narrow attitude? The sectarian argument should be easily settled, since no one is required to accept its teachings. There are not, I believe, great doctrinal differences between the King James version and the Douay version of the Bible, but, even if there were, there is not the slightest compulsion towards their acceptance.

From the Jewish point of view, I do not see any objection to the New Testament, since one is not in the least required to believe in the origin or mission or message of Jesus. If the question of misrepresentation is raised, it would seem quite as reasonable to prohibit some of the plays of Shakespeare, such as "The Merchant of Venice" and some other great literature. Thomas Jefferson was not a churchman, and he was certainly the champion of religious freedom. He said, "I have sworn upon the altar of God eternal hostility against every form of tyranny over the mind of man." But he believed in Almighty God, and he held fast to the moral principles of Jesus. He declared "I am a *real Christian*, that is to say, a disciple of the doctrines of Jesus." It was Jefferson's ideal for this nation that all men should follow the teachings of Jesus, and thus, as he said, "We should all be of one sect, doers of good, and eschewers of evil. No doctrines of his (Jesus) lead to schism." "Of all the systems of morality, ancient or modern, which have come under my observation, none appear to me so pure as that of Jesus."

In an address on "Education and Freedom," given a few years ago, Dr. A. W. Pickard-Cambridge, Vice Chancellor of Sheffield University, speaking before a section of the British Association for the Advancement of Science, said:

I am convinced that the tendency for many years to relegate the study of the Bible to a place of almost complete unimportance in the curriculum has been a fatal mistake. . . . Almost all the principles which distinguish the most progressive modern civilization from the barbarism to which some apparently desire to return are those which are found in the New Testament and which as a mere matter of history have found their way into civilization from that source; and it is significant that both in Germany and Russia the consciousness of this has been so strong that the suppression of freedom has been closely combined with an attack upon the Christian religion. If it is urged that the young ought to be left free to make up their own minds about religious matters, I reply that they have at least the right to be given the chance to do so by being supplied with the materials for the decision, as is done in regard to every other matter which is of importance; otherwise they *have* no real freedom of choice. . . . It is constantly repeated that any man has a right to his opinion; and this is true if it is his opinion. But it is not true, if it is some other person's opinion, accepted without thought; nor even if it is his own, but formed without reflection and deliberate impartiality.

Another misinterpretation and misuse of both freedom and religion is seen in the anti-evolution laws of some states, including the famous Scopes trial at Dayton, Tennessee, in 1925. Intelligent Tennesseans are not particularly proud of this chapter of our history. The Bible was never intended to be a book of science, and most people had abandoned the idea that the Bible was an authority on astronomy or geology. It is not a book of magic, nor is it a library of universal knowledge, but it is the supreme moral and spiritual guide for those who have eyes to see, minds to know and hearts to love. It is not a book of external authority, but of inner illumination. The legislature evidently had the power to pass this foolish law, but it is a pathetic picture to see a group of well-meaning, doubtless, but ignorant men attempt to determine by legislative fiat what is truth. The fundamental issue as to the relation of science and religion is before a higher court than any judicial tribunal. Some one has said, "It is difficult to set limits to the harm which may be done in the world by the muddle headedness of good people."

As we view our nation today, the situation is not entirely reas-

suring. There have been vast developments, and some progress has been made, but we have also sustained some mighty losses. Instead of having as little government as possible and that government supported by the people, the tendency is towards complexity of government, the building up of vast bureaucracies and a government which supports the people. Too much paternalism and regimentation are the foe of freedom and democracy. Popular education, we have felt, was an absolute requirement for a democracy, as well as for the advancement of the human race. We have spent huge sums for it, expected great results from it, and are a bit disappointed. The old codes and customs by which many men lived have been dissolved in the acids of modernity. The depth and power, the moral grip, evidenced in the religious life of that earlier period, is not so apparent today. Life was not easy then, but there were men of character, and they faced hardships without flinching or whining. They believed something, and they had the courage of their convictions. There were some things that they would neither do nor stand for. They had an inner loyalty to something greater than kings, stronger than armies, more imperative than popular majorities. Thomas Carlyle said of his father that "he was religious with the consent of all his faculties." This is not today the prevailing temper. Seven years ago Alfred Noyes said:

The chief characteristic of the intellectual world during the last fifty years is its gradual loss of the old simplicity and integrity which went so deep, went right down to the roots of life with men like Milton and Wordsworth in literature, or Abraham Lincoln in statesmanship.

We have been captivated by the desire for *having*, rather than the desire for *being*.

"It is," says Dean Inge, "because we have been misled into attaching absolute value to things that have it not, to man-made institutions, to transient enthusiasm, to all the idols of the cave and the market-place, that our faith in immortality has come to burn so dim. . . . It is the prevailing secularism which has caused the belief in eternal life to be swept away. . . . If we looked within, we should find both heaven and hell there. The highest human life tells us most about heaven, the lowest human life tells us most about hell." There has been a decided spiritual lag and a lowering of moral standards.

President Lowell, in *What a University President Has Learned*, says, "It is, of course, easy to exaggerate the decay of earlier convictions, to treat as universal what is only partial, as absolute what is only a tendency; yet it is clear that there has been a weakening, for example, in the obligation of contracts, public, international and private—the cement that has made possible the structure of the modern world. This, to the writer is more ominous than the danger of war, or of any change in industrial organization made in an orderly way. Future historians will trace the causes of the changes in attitude; it suffices here to note them."

Some of us who believe that education is truncated that does not deal with the whole man, who are old-fashioned enough to believe that religion in some form or another is essential to every full, rounded education, have the conviction that we exercise our freedom to be irreligious at our own and our nation's peril. President Roosevelt said, in an address about a year ago, that three institutions indispensable to Americans are being challenged today, and that the first of these, religion, "is the source of the other two"—of democracy and international good faith. No one would affirm that Christianity could not function except in a democracy, but few would deny that the democratic system offers the best opportunity for realizing the Christian life in its fulness, and probably none would question the fact that the fundamental basis of democracy is religion.

Democracy is a way of life and for that way religion is essential. Under all the mutations of life and variations of culture, he remains just man, and his spiritual needs are unchanged. What the exiled Spanish philosopher, Unamuno, calls "man's homesickness for eternity" will always remain. The change which has come over the civilized world during the last fifty years is due solely to the loss of any central and unifying faith. President Robert M. Hutchins, besides noting strongly the necessity for greater discipline, points to a similar loss in the field of liberal arts education, the lack of integration. He suggests metaphysics as that integrating factor, others suggest theology, still others the Christian philosophy of life. Thoughtful people, I believe, are agreed that, both in education and in religion, there must be a return to greater discipline, and to some central, unifying philosophy of living if we are to make the most of the stuff that God has

given us. Religion, which has been defined by some as "devotion to the highest," can and will bring the inner unity and integrity which men need. Sin is not a popular word, but it is a fact in the world and it is not easily disposed of. It is the fruit of self-will and hangs on the tree of life in the form of pride, sensuality and selfishness. There is no short cut to salvation through some esoteric formula that sidesteps the plain necessity of making us more decent and dependable human beings. Love and understanding are the primary virtues in the ethical system and they are not easily attained. Henry C. Link, in *The Return to Religion* says, "No discovery of modern psychology is in my opinion so important as its scientific proof of the necessity of self-sacrifice or discipline to self-realization and happiness. By nature, the individual is selfish and inclined to follow his immediate impulses. . . . It requires religion, or something higher than the individual, or even a society of individuals, to overcome the selfish impulses of the natural man, and to lead him to a fuller and more successful life."

The citizen of Zion, as the Bible quaintly calls him, is the world's greatest need today and every day—the straightforward, broad-minded man of sound judgment and principle, the man "that sweareth to his own hurt, and changeth not." It is our business as so-called educators to try to develop men and women of that stamp. It can be done without violating our fundamental tenet of religious freedom and without attempting to turn the clock back, but it cannot be done without intelligence and devotion. It cannot be done by a people who care only for such progress as can be measured by statistics, but it can be done by a people who sincerely offer up the prayer of the wise king who thought that wisdom did not consist in mathematical knowledge, but in an understanding heart able to discriminate between good and evil. I believe that the Bible is still the foundation of our civilization, that it is not a sectarian book, and that a knowledge of its truths and duties is of the utmost importance for every citizen. If, however, this point of view is not granted then I would suggest that such portions of the Bible as the Ten Commandments and the teachings of Jesus be accepted as the basis for moral education. The Psalms and the thirteenth chapter of First Corinthians might also well be added for this purpose. If this suggestion is con-

sidered too broad, then I would mention two verses—one verse from the Old Testament which sums up the matter in a remarkable way, Micah 6:8, "What doth the Lord require of thee, but to do justly, and to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God"; and another from the New Testament, "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind; and thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself."

L. P. Jacks quotes with approval Goethe's word, "The highest cannot be spoken," but as Jacks says, "it can be *acted*." For this reason it is essential that the teaching profession be made up of those who, whatever other qualifications are required, are devoted to the highest. Truth, Beauty, Goodness are undoubtedly ultimate realities of the universe and they are all actable. Values have to be discovered or felt rather than taught. They cannot be taught but they can be killed, and nothing can kill them more quickly than the modern cynicism of the pseudo-intellectual. When values are seen flowering in a life, one may not be able to prove the value but he cannot doubt it. The personal transmission of value is the most effective and only completely pertinent way.

The most far-reaching, if not the greatest, calamity connected with the situation in Germany today is the deliberate and persistent miseducation of her youth. How can this be corrected? Will these young people ever come to know the truth about these matters in which they are now being falsely instructed? Let us not forget, however, that by our indifference to or neglect of spiritual values in our educational system, we can reach here a somewhat similar result. If the battle of civilization is lost in the schools, who is going to win it afterwards? President Robert G. Sproul, of the University of California, has said:

I believe that religion (not the sects) is basic to morals, central in our American culture, unique as a dynamic within the individual, able to save us from ourselves and lead us out into nobility. I believe that without religion we are forced to substitute weak conventions for permanent values and abiding standards; that, without religion, civilization, with no adequate reinforcement for the great strains that come upon it, must yield inevitably to disintegration and decay. Believing these things, I believe also that the university which makes no effort to stimulate in its sons and daughters a sensitive-

ness to the issues of religion is likely to be a danger rather than a benefit to the state.

There rests upon the educational institutions and agencies of this country a tremendous responsibility for its future and for the welfare of succeeding generations. It is for us to determine whether we will face up to the urgent necessity of recovering some of those types of spiritual vision which the modern world has undoubtedly lost, whether we think we can build an enduring civilization on the basis of a materialistic philosophy and the trivialities of an irreligious life; or whether it should not be our primary concern, by both mental and moral discipline, in the company of select personalities, to develop great souls, deep in the secrets of religion, whose faith in an ideal and spiritual world unifies life, puts glorious meaning into it and confirms the fact that we are sons of the Eternal. We have the freedom to be religious, and we had better be, if we seek to perpetuate our democracy and its institutions.

FREEDOM AS AFFECTED BY FINANCES

J. W. LOWES

FINANCIAL VICE-PRESIDENT, HARVARD UNIVERSITY

AS my listeners will shortly discover for themselves, these remarks are general in character, for I unfortunately appear not to have developed sufficient imagination to make them otherwise. Since there is little point in elaborating generalities, they are also brief; and I hope that there may be wit in their brevity if not in their substance.

At a time when half of the world is involved in a deliberate and wholly cynical effort to destroy every form of what we consider liberty it is highly appropriate that we examine the condition of all of our free institutions, for I have no doubt we shall all agree that the next ten years will be decisive in determining to what extent they are to be maintained. And the position of colleges and universities in our free state is of peculiar importance in the sense that they actively create principles of freedom as well as enjoy them.

Educational institutions, like individuals, are apt to appraise their degree of freedom in terms of the financial considerations which go to establish their standards of living. If this quantitative form of liberty were to be my assignment, I could spend a relatively effortless interval in discussing, with the aid of readily available statistics, some of the unhappy subjects with which we are all so familiar. For between us we have experienced in one way or another diminished income from tuitions, a sharply lower return on our investments, a decrease in benefactions or curtailed appropriations from states and municipalities. Similarly we may all fear the less than remote possibility of higher prices for goods and services through some radical form of credit or currency inflation, and those of us whose institutions are privately controlled are constantly exposed to the hazards of taxation.

I judge, however, that it is our qualitative rather than our quantitative liberties with which we are concerned, our freedom to teach and to investigate with the establishment of truth as the sole aim.

In the extraordinary growth of the number, size and com-

plexity of our institutions of higher learning since the start of the century we have undoubtedly ourselves committed, on grounds largely financial, some acts of violence to that quality of freedom. The comprehensive duplication of many of our facilities; our competition for students, so often on grounds not relevant to academic standards; our ready assumption of the concealed and deferred liabilities inherent in too narrowly restricted endowments and buildings too expensive; our partnership with intercollegiate football; all of these seem to me to have moved in that direction. These matters have, however, been accidents of growth. No malice or element of coercion entered into them, and, given such a period of maturity and consolidation as we might have expected in a world moving with less rapidity than the one in which we now find ourselves, they might have been painlessly liquidated. I believe that they now damage our potential freedom principally in the fact that in the aggregate they have weakened our financial position at a time when financial strength and independence may be vital. For in the material sense, with all forms of social organization, freedom cannot be disassociated from strength, nor strength from financial considerations.

It is rather, I think, obvious that if our essential liberties are to be seriously impaired or lost altogether, it will not be as the direct result of our own misdemeanors but through some form of pressure from outside our own walls or foreign to our best academic traditions. I qualify traditions in this instance by the use of the word "academic," since we will all take it for granted that if the entire civil liberties of our country should disappear in some spectacular disintegration of our Constitution, academic freedom, being only a part of the whole, would disappear as well. For while education holds a leading place in the defenses against such a catastrophe, it has no unique formula for avoiding the consequences of defeat. Hence the pressures which deserve practical consideration must be assumed to come within the framework of existing constitutional safeguards. Such pressures might well be expected to follow financial channels.

Conceivably pressure of this nature might come about from the community as a whole through the withholding of students from institutions which permitted the free discussion of doctrines

generally believed to be unorthodox. This may well have happened when our society was more compact and when and where the issue of academic liberty centered on burning questions of religion. It appears to me, however, that there are today, and promise to remain so, a sufficient number of points of view on any subject to make any general pressure from this direction highly improbable. I do feel obliged in passing to quote, with no intention of drawing a parallel, an illustration of the free differences of political thought existing in the faculties of Fascist Italy as given a few years ago by the Professor of Political Science at Perugia University. He explained that "It is generally the students themselves who pass judgment on these differences by deserting, as is their right, the classes of the non-Fascist professors."

Such pressure might come from the withholding, on similar grounds, of financial support by alumni and the charitably-disposed public. In a limited way this is undoubtedly not unknown, but here again the existence of differing points of view would seem to present an adequate safeguard, further reinforced by the probability that college graduates and the charitably inclined may be more inclined than the average to possess a liberal attitude. At the institution which I represent we occasionally hear of alumni who disown the University because "it" (and I have "it" in quotation marks) is too far to the left; but these are balanced by those who feel that it is too far to the right.

Pressure has, I am afraid, been known to come from private, as well as public, boards of trustees holding the appropriating power. Our Commission on Academic Freedom and Academic Tenure, whose report I have not heard as this is written, will be the best judge as to the extent to which this occurs. My impression is that such incidents are comparatively rare and promise to be increasingly so.

Such possibilities, and there are no doubt others which could be named, might be expanded. I mention them largely to eliminate them, since the pressure which appears to me to be the most threatening, both in likelihood and in effect, would be brought about through the progressive intervention of the State.

I hasten to say that I am aware of the fact that higher educa-

tion in this country is, and for over a hundred years has been, largely publicly controlled and subsidized. Indeed, in the latest biennial survey of higher education published by the U. S. Office of Education it is shown that total receipts of the publicly controlled institutions exceeded the receipts of those which are privately controlled. The development side by side of our publicly and privately administered colleges and universities has been a unique development of our nation and one from which unique advantages have accrued.

But this development has not sprung from a single stem—it has sprung from the imitative but independent acts of forty-eight legislatures. The state and municipal institutions have all had a substantial degree of local character, their control has been local, even the abuses of control have had essentially a local flavor. And it is my understanding that abuses connected with the appropriating authority, legislative and executive, have been by and large motivated more by what we call petty politics than by any deliberate or consecutive intention to interfere with the abstractions of academic freedom. The consciousness that the standards applied to the publicly administered institutions in the various states are susceptible of comparison, and the presence in the same communities at large of the privately administered institutions have acted as checks and balances. There has never been the deadening influence of a common denominator.

Intervention by the Federal Government would, I believe, be an entirely different matter leading in time to entirely different results. Let me make it clear that in speaking of the Federal Government I am not meaning to identify it in any exclusive way with the policies of the present national administration. While, under the stress of economic circumstances, these policies in the domestic field have been directed, almost entirely, to a rapid and in some cases precipitate extension of the areas of Federal influence and control, extension, rather than retraction, has been the tendency for many years and promises to continue so indefinitely. At the most, every step backward has been followed by two steps in advance.

Time may prove that the enlargement of Federal functions is necessary and desirable; that commerce, industry and finance should answer to Washington for the majority of their acts. It

may prove that what we call social security can only be attained through Federal auspices. It may prove that the public health should be a Federal charge. It may even prove that opportunities for secondary education can be equalized only through Federal aid. I believe, however, that time would prove that any general participation of the Federal Government in higher education had been a calamity.

I realize that in the greater part of free Europe higher education has been either directly controlled by the State or, as in England, partly subsidized by the State, and that academic liberty is unimpaired in the England of today as it was in the Germany of yesterday. I cannot believe that our temper or traditions are adapted to such an outcome. From what we have seen of Federal participation in other spheres, it is impossible to believe that any general Federal subsidization of higher education could long remain divorced from bureaucratic regulation and the paternalistic creation of a standard pattern of accomplishment. It is impossible to believe that it could long remain uninfluenced by the less desirable consequences of party politics.

My own belief is that the atmosphere and opportunities thus created would lead to more deliberate interference with the very essentials of academic freedom. This is, I realize, an opinion in no way susceptible to proof and on which no evidence can be adduced. Possibly we should remain free to continue our attempts to preserve and reinvigorate the humanities. Possibly we should remain free to prosecute our far-reaching investigations into the realms of pure science. Possibly national administrations of the future would consistently adopt a tolerant and liberal attitude toward the application of funds under their control to truly free inquiry into and exposition of the multitude of controversial issues which make up the social sciences and in which any administration would have an overwhelming interest—issues of economic theory, human relations and the science of government itself. Possibly we should expect all these things. I can only say that I doubt it.

It may well be asked whether, even if everything which I have said be agreed to, these remarks are advancing to any constructive conclusion either in content or in time. The one which I should like to offer is the conclusion that we should do every-

thing in our powers to conserve our independent financial strength even at the expense of material sacrifices.

At the present time we are between us enjoying the use of large Federal appropriations for vocational instruction, largely agricultural and principally through the land-grant institutions which are *sui generis*. Many of us who are publicly controlled have accepted buildings from emergency funds which were otherwise going begging, this I understand in some cases to the subsequent discomfort of the taxpayers of the individual states. A majority of us have accepted the administration of grants for the benefit of students who otherwise, occasionally in theory only, could not continue their studies. In terms of academic freedom these seem sufficiently innocuous, and possibly as things now stand they are so, although between them they have substantially doubled over a ten-year period the proportion of our total receipts derived from the Federal Government.

My belief is, however, that we have hard and critical years ahead of us when the aftermath of world events will have reached a new climax. When those days come we may well be driven to ask for more general assistance from the Federal Treasury. And the husbanding of our existing formidable resources should be the best insurance against our being driven to ask. I suggest that we should, wherever possible, eliminate and avoid unnecessary duplications; that we should critically examine expensive building projects; that we should bend all our efforts toward making prospective donors visualize the future objectively; that we should avoid explorations into what Abraham Flexner has termed "... fleeting, transient and immediate demands. . . ." I suggest above all that our endowed institutions, which may continue to set some part of the pace, should conserve their endowments rather than exhaust them in the expectation that their position will be filled by some other means compatible with our liberties.

Through such a policy of financial independence and conservation I believe that we can, as in other ways, contribute largely to the preservation of academic freedom, and it is to us in the western hemisphere that the whole world may be obliged to turn to observe again the precepts of liberty.

FREEDOM IN LEGISLATION

FRED PIERCE CORSON

PRESIDENT, DICKINSON COLLEGE

THE situation which has developed in relation to legislation and the freedom of the independent college in its present stage may be likened to a "war of nerves." The independent colleges know the power of legislation, if used, to take away their freedom. The protection of utility afforded by their need to meet the educational demands of the people weakens with each move toward the expansion and strengthening of the tax-supported institutions.

That many have looked in the direction of the independent colleges for additional governmental revenue through taxation clearly indicates that their freedom in this phase of legislation no longer goes unchallenged. Examples abound of the inevitable consequences of the attack upon "independence" by the use of ideologies which stir up popular feeling. "Peoples colleges," "education for all," "higher education, the responsibility of the State" are catch words which have made possible legislation which reduces both the sources of income and the areas of usefulness of the independent college. All of these "straws in the wind" point out clearly the danger to the freedom of the independent college through legislation which restricts its service, curtails its income and weakens by its requirements the virility of its academic life. In the light of legislative proposals, state educational department policies and the public utterances of political leaders, there is small wonder that the independent college group has become "jittery."

In preparing this paper I have corresponded with many persons connected with colleges, state departments and educational foundations and organizations scattered throughout the United States. From them I gather that the problem is not local nor sectional, though it is more pronounced in some states than in others. All agreed that it is a real problem and not one of those hypothetical situations, the discussion of which delights a certain type of academic mind. The correspondence also indicated that attempts to enact laws in state legislatures detrimental to the

freedom of the independent colleges has for the most part been thwarted, although in certain instances concessions have had to be made. There was general agreement, however, that like the camel which once it gets its nose inside, will eventually occupy the tent, so legislation interfering even slightly with the freedom of our independent colleges once in force will open the way to more serious and comprehensive infringements upon this freedom.

Legislation proposed or enacted thus far which would affect the freedom of the privately endowed college may be classified in several groups.

THE DANGER OF LEGISLATION TO FREEDOM THROUGH TAXATION

First, there is the group of legislation endangering the freedom of the independent college through taxation. From the inception of our government, colleges like churches have enjoyed freedom from taxation in return for services rendered by the colleges to the general welfare of the Nation. Here and there an argument based upon a particular social theory has been advanced against the practice, but the advocates of such a proposal have gotten little support. With mounting expenditures for government, local, state and national, legislators are faced with the alternatives of increasing the tax rate or seeking new sources of revenue and the seeking of new sources of revenue is the more popular course to pursue. Naturally the non-state colleges offer a most lucrative field for this purpose. They hold property and endowments valued at \$3,000,000,000. I cannot within the limits of this paper cite all of the instances where attempts to tax colleges have been made. I will, however, cite a few cases to indicate the types of taxes proposed. Cambridge attempted to get Harvard on the local tax list and Connecticut sought to tax Yale by the ingenious method of passing a law to tax non-producing college property situated outside of the town in which the college is located. In 1936 Tennessee enacted a law to tax non-income producing college property, excluding buildings situated upon the college campus. Michigan proposed to tax dormitories and did make colleges subject to the sales tax while exempting state institutions.

The most comprehensive plan to tax colleges was proposed at the 1937 session of the Indiana State Legislature. Of it President William C. Dennis of Earlham College said, "But for the most

determined efforts at the last session (of the Legislature) colleges would now be paying an intangible tax upon their endowments, they would be paying gross income tax upon at least a large part of their revenues, and they would have been compelled immediately rather than in 1944 to pay taxes upon so-called income producing properties which they had been forced to take over on account of the depression, and they would have been fortunate if there had not been added to this a so-called service charge (alias for tax) upon every college building as recommended by the legislative committee which reported on taxation to the 1937 session of the Legislature."

To these direct attempts at taxation by state and local taxing agencies may be added laws already enacted which discriminate against the independent college, such as the income tax which included the employees of non-state institutions and until 1939 exempted the employees of state institutions, thus curtailing the freedom of the independent college to compete for teachers with state institutions on an equal financial basis, since the law in effect provided a cash subsidy for every teacher employed in a state institution.

More serious is the threat to endowed institutions from what former President Angell describes as "the relentless impositions on income and legacies of benevolent individuals, two sources from which the endowed institutions have in the past secured a large part of their essential resources." By means of such indirect taxation all endowed colleges and universities could be compelled to close their doors or come under state or federal control.

The recent experience which the independent colleges had with Social Security taxes indicates what can happen when taxation in a modified form is established for these institutions. You will recall that the proposal to include the colleges in the Government's Old Age Insurance plan had expanded by the time it came up for enactment to include unemployment insurance and in the light of the employment record of the colleges this would have proved a very profitable piece of business for the government insurance agency.

The freedom of the independent colleges involved in taxation is the freedom to live and to maintain their vigor in competition with

state-supported institutions and to pursue truth unmolested by laws which may be used as clubs at the behest of pressure groups and political philosophies.

The challenge to the Government's right to do this has been ably put by President Nicholas Murray Butler, who said in a recent report, "If, therefore, Government undertakes in the exercise of its duly granted powers to adopt and enforce a scheme of taxation which makes these benefactions (of the colleges) for public service in the field of liberty impossible, then Government is attacking the public interest and the public service at their very foundation."

THE DANGER OF LEGISLATION TO FREEDOM THROUGH APPROPRIATIONS

Another danger to the freedom of the independent college through legislation lies in state and federal appropriations both as grants to these institutions and as grants to state-controlled institutions in competition with the non-state college. Direct grants for specific purposes, joint financial responsibility for buildings and equipment which may be used both by college and community, annual appropriations for which a responsibility to educate certain persons is assumed and government scholarships such as are provided by the NYA, are types of appropriations available for both independent and state-supported institutions. Such grants, I believe, have been motivated by the highest intentions. They represent attempts to meet a situation which involves both the citizen and the institution. That they do provide partial solution to an immediate problem cannot be denied. The danger does not lie in the immediate consequences of the acceptance of such an appropriation. The immediate reaction may be good—a life-saver—such as a hypodermic. The real danger lies in the ultimate and inevitable consequences, the condition produced by dependence upon this form of help. We make a great mistake in attempting to find solutions for our vexing public problems by not considering the solution offered in terms of all of its relations and consequences. The outcome of so many of these solutions reminds one of the gas which Ed Wynn, the famous comedian, is supposed to have invented to cure pains around the heart. A whiff of the gas removes the pain around the heart but causes

the teeth to turn black; another whiff restores the teeth to their original color but results also in the hair falling out; a third whiff will bring back the hair but with it the pain around the heart will also return.

A procedure may produce an immediate good and an ultimate harm. This, it appears to me, is the danger to freedom lurking in state and government subsidies. Appropriations always carry with them some measure of control. The terms of control may be directly stated or implied in the agreement or the appropriation may appear to be without strings, but in any event the possibility of control is present if conditions demanding its use arise.

The *Baltimore Sun* in an editorial appearing in the issue of December 12, 1939, made the following comment on the Maryland system of appropriation to the independent colleges of the state. "When a college receives from the state the equivalent of the income of an endowment of \$2,000,000 or more, that college cannot be altogether a free agent. It may think it is free, but the moment it starts something displeasing to any considerable proportion of the public, it may discover that its freedom has limits."

The NYA work scholarships, while presenting no evidence of coercion as yet, carry the possibility of control referred to by the editor of the *Baltimore Sun*. It is significant, I think, that the ultimate selection of the students receiving these scholarships no longer rests in the college, but lies with the State NYA Authority, and that certain citizenship tests are now being required.

The fact that both state and non-state institutions receive NYA appropriations does not guarantee their continued impartial distribution. Officials of the NYA have been of late quoted as intimating that these grants should be confined solely to state-controlled institutions.

A more pressing danger to the freedom of the non-state college lies in the mounting appropriations for state-controlled institutions. Step by step through these appropriations state institutions are taking over areas of education served by the independent colleges and are diverting the stream of students which has formerly flowed into them. The program for municipal junior colleges and for the expansion of state teachers colleges provides the clearest evidence of what is happening in this respect. Wherever such a program creates competition and does not confine

itself solely to meeting needs which existing agencies cannot satisfy, it endangers the freedom of the independent college.

Perhaps the least dangerous type of appropriation to the freedom of our institutions is the direct grant to the student based upon merit rather than political favor with permission for its use by the student at the institution of the student's choice. This form of appropriation, with a few notable exceptions, seems, however, to be the least favored, both by legislatures and state departments of education.

THE DANGER OF LEGISLATION TO FREEDOM THROUGH INTERPRETATION AND ADMINISTRATION

A third possibility of infringement upon the freedom of the independent college lies in the authority given state departments of education and other governmental agencies through blanket legislation and the interpretation and administration of that legislation by state officials. Please understand that I am not questioning the motives nor the honesty of these officials by the statement I have just made. I have in mind rather what may happen when legislation of this sort is interpreted and administered according to a philosophy of education significantly different from that held by the independent college group.

This danger appears chiefly in the field of teacher education where prescription of methods setting forth the quantitative considerations of how, when and what, rather than evaluation of results in the qualitative standards of knowledge and ability have made it increasingly difficult for institutions without the financial recourses of state appropriations or with a differing philosophy of teacher education to exercise one of their original functions, namely the preparation of teachers for the public schools. The removal or impairment of function does, I believe, constitute a restriction upon freedom. This restriction upon the free exercise of function growing out of legislation setting up standards for teacher preparation and their oftentimes arbitrary interpretation was referred to by most of my correspondents connected with the non-state colleges. Many of them expressed the feeling that so far as the preparation of teachers was concerned the independent college was being liquidated. The more competence to teach, which should be the fundamental intent of all legislation relating

to teachers requirements, is determined by the satisfaction of a method the more threatening liquidation of the independent college from this field of education becomes.

Another element of danger to the freedom of the privately endowed college is inherent in the tendency to centralize and increase authority in state and federal agencies. While such procedure may be proposed in the interest of service we should not overlook the fact that it leads ultimately to service with control. A federal department of education with Cabinet standing and a large national budget for distribution may appear desirable to educational units disorganized and in financial distress, but its possibilities for control may be visualized by a consideration of the amount and character of control which a federal authority such as the Inter-State Commerce Commission has been able to effect.

Another instrument administered by public officials which the independent colleges should examine for its effect upon the freedom of these colleges is the questionnaire. On first consideration a business honestly conducted may appear to have nothing to fear from answering questions. But the government has sensed the power of facts gotten by this means and interpreted by interested parties to influence public opinion and to accomplish through the medium of a public attitude what by law would be impossible of enactment or because of its unconstitutionality impossible of enforcement. While the right of the charter granting authority to determine whether or not the terms of the charter are being performed by the grantee is fully recognized the danger against which we should guard comes in what may be considered essential information for this purpose and in the interpretation given the information gathered and the uses to which it may be put.

THE DANGER TO FREEDOM THROUGH PATRIOTICALLY, RELIGIOUSLY
AND SOCIALLY MOTIVATED LEGISLATION

The "pressure group" is a factor in administration with which our forefathers did not have to deal, but against which, perhaps unknowingly, they sought to safeguard their colleges by their charters of independence. Legislation advanced for patriotic and religious reasons which would hamper the quest for truth and its presentation did not seriously concern our founding fathers.

They feared infringement upon freedom in this domain from the sponsoring agencies and not from the government. Within recent years, however, we have witnessed a threat to the freedom of the independent college in its search for and presentation of truth by legislation religiously motivated stipulating what could be taught and by legislation patriotically motivated which stipulates who can teach it.

The threat to freedom in scholarship by laws in the interest of a given theological position can be passed over as a spent force in American academic life. Where such legislation remains on the statute books, it has become a dead letter because the fear of political heresies has largely replaced the fear of religious heresies in the public mind. If totalitarianism comes to the United States this threat of legislation defining what from a theological standpoint can be taught may become very real as it has in Germany and Russia, but until then the threat to freedom of speech and freedom of knowledge within our independent colleges by legislation lies in the direction of patriotically motivated laws which appeal for their sanction to emotions rather than to reason. In spite of the predominance of republican college student bodies as indicated by current political polls, the man in the street has the idea that our college faculties and student bodies are composed largely of "Reds" and it has been the predominance of this sentiment which accounts for the fact that "Teacher Oath" laws have either been proposed or enacted in practically every state in the Union. The danger lurking in these laws both to freedom of speech and freedom of knowledge has been widely discussed and their implication of suspicion places the teaching profession under a shadow from which other professions are exempt. (For a statement of the case against the Teacher Oath law see Boston University President's Annual Report for 1935.)

The Oath required by most of these laws is innocuously worded. All of us could subscribe to such a declaration of allegiance most heartily, but in a situation where truth as the scholar sees it may run counter to popular sentiment such an oath may be used as an effective snuffer for the light of truth. Our intellectual centers have always been the Nation's "Independence Halls" since only by the knowledge of truth do men become free and I shudder to think what might have happened if in the colonial colleges the dis-

seminators of the new interpretation of liberty and freedom had been silenced by an official oath.

Democracy and religion cannot be legislated. Their safeguards reside in the hearts and minds of men free to express and defend the right as God gives them to see the right.

In some of our states the independent colleges have witnessed the possibility of curtailment of their freedom to meet the financial needs of their students by the restrictions placed upon conditions of work through socially motivated legislation hastily drawn up and avowedly experimental in nature. William Hard, economist and correspondent, has likened this type of socially motivated experimental legislation to "boarding a train without knowing its destination" with the result that "we are always waking up and looking out of the window and cursing the scenery." An illustration of the effect of this type of legislation upon a traditional method of supplying work for students in college is the Wage and Hour Law enacted by the Legislature of Pennsylvania in 1937. By its stipulation of the spread of work hours within any one day it would have been illegal for college students to wait upon tables. The colleges were saved from this embarrassment by the fact that the law was declared unconstitutional.

The world should know that education as carried on in our independent colleges puts no obstacles in the way of social legislation based upon fair practice and capable of producing genuinely beneficial effects. In truth it prepares the way for such legislation. There is a danger, however, that the machinery of government and society may be seriously damaged by ill advised and hastily constructed social legislation which defeats its purpose by its own inadequacy. Colleges as employers and operators of properties used for public purposes have a responsibility for the critical examination of all so-called "social" legislation, lest its enactment motivated by the best of intentions makes impossible education in our independent colleges for the economically less favored.

THE DANGER OF LEGISLATION TO FREEDOM THROUGH INEFFECTIVE OPPOSITION

Perhaps the most serious danger to the freedom of the independent college through legislation lies in the ineffective action of

those whose business it is to protect that freedom. The cause suffers at times because presidents are statesmen and not politicians. They are authorities on the philosophy of freedom. They can present arguments for the freedom of independent colleges so logical that they are irrefutable. But in dealing with the instrumentalities which may either safeguard that freedom or remove it, they are all too often unrealistic, impractical, disunited in approach and therefore ineffective.

Legislation does not go very far beyond a supporting public opinion. This fact the modern approach to the curtailment of freedom recognizes and circumvents by presenting what may appear to be inconsequential demands first, but the concession once having been made acts as a springboard for more far-reaching demands which are certain to follow. Modern battles for freedom have been lost by the acquiescence to those first and insignificant demands which appear so inconsequential as to be hardly worth fighting for. An aroused and informed public opinion is the most effective safeguard our freedom can depend upon.

Because we live in a world where "they have rights who dare maintain them" current methods for expressing and defending our freedom should not be overlooked. "Locking the stable after the horse has been stolen" has afforded small comfort in the past, because it is a matter of common knowledge that freedom once surrendered is indeed hard to regain. An organized and planned effort to keep in touch with the political scene would avoid the all too frequent situations when knowledge of legislation detrimental to the freedom of the independent colleges comes too late for effective opposition.

Amateurs and volunteers cannot be expected to match or checkmate in every instance the activities of professionals whose jobs make possible close contact with the processes of legislation.

Some sentences from Dr. James Rowland Angell's address on "The Future of Intellectual Freedom" contain sound advice for those who must give thought to the maintenance of freedom for the independent institution of learning in and through legislation. Referring to the experiences of the past Dr. Angell said, "The lesson for folk like us is to stop our feeble bleating about the menace to intellectual freedom and give our active and aggressive support to policies and measures which will spare us its loss.

(This freedom) must be constantly won anew and by unflagging effort, directed not alone against political coercion but against every subtle intellectual influence which tends to distort or misrepresent truth. No more than civil liberty is intellectual liberty to be gained by incessant and courageous struggle. The weakling has no place in this fight."

THE RELATIONS BETWEEN THE LIBERAL ARTS COLLEGE, THE JUNIOR COLLEGE AND THE PROFESSIONAL SCHOOL

JAMES P. BAXTER, 3RD
PRESIDENT, WILLIAMS COLLEGE

THE relations of the liberal arts colleges to the junior colleges, in New England at least, are in no way close. At Williams, for example, we have to date admitted only four students from junior colleges. The records of these young men with us ranged all the way from failure to selection for membership in Phi Beta Kappa; but the sample is far too small for the results to be significant. The objectives and programs of the junior colleges are so different from those of the New England institutions devoted to the liberal arts ideal that it is small wonder that closer connections have not developed between them.

Sharp as these distinctions are they are not apparent to all. A Williams alumnus of nearly twenty years standing who has been grappling with the problem of educating six children recently suggested to me that we should revise our curriculum drastically, introduce courses of a vocational nature and establish a degree which could be achieved in two years by students destined for business or industry. The four-year course, he asserted, was necessary and desirable only for those who intended to pursue post-graduate work.

In these days of large-scale unemployment when graduates of our high schools find it harder than ever before to get jobs, it is not surprising that the enrolment in our educational institutions has increased and that the demand for vocational training has become more insistent. The liberal arts colleges have come under heavy fire, have been denounced as outmoded havens for an intellectual élite and purveyors of useless and expensive luxuries. There is not the slightest question that the United States does need more and better vocational training, and that the furnishing of instruction to a much larger number of high school graduates for a year or two after the completion of their secondary education is a crying need of the hour. In meeting this need the junior colleges have beyond question performed a great service to the nation.

But whether or not the liberal arts colleges should transform themselves and cater to the need for vocational instruction and for a two year course subsequent to the high-school, is another question altogether. Too many people who ought to know better are ready to say yes. Some of those who are yielding under pressure do not say yes frankly, but by a change of emphasis are stressing the possibilities for vocational training within the liberal arts college. It is small wonder that the prevalence of these opinions should lead one of my friends to suggest that Williams follow this path.

Unlikely as the acceptance of his suggestion may be, the consequences which would ensue deserve consideration. Only about forty per cent of Williams graduates in recent years have pursued further study at the university level, and of these one in every four has been enrolled in graduate schools of business administration. The elimination from our student body of more than half our juniors and seniors, would affect every aspect of our curricular and extra-curricular activities. Thanks to careful selection from a large number of applicants for admission, we have been able to reduce to a marked degree the number of failures in college and to carry through to graduation more than seventy per cent of those who enrol as freshmen. Instead of a slight decline in the size of each class at the end of sophomore year we should witness an exodus of nearly two-thirds of our sophomores. We should consequently be faced with the alternative of lowering the maximum size of the college from the present figure of a little over eight hundred to a little more than six hundred, or of increasing by nearly forty per cent the size of each entering class.

Whatever the results might be to the outward and visible form of the college the effect on its inward and spiritual grace would be nothing short of catastrophic. Convinced supporters of the liberal arts ideal hold that four years are if anything too short a time in which to plant and water and tend its seeds satisfactorily. The crop, in the larger sense, should be of the "ever-bearing" variety, and the greater part of it must be garnered by the individual in whom it is planted through long years after his graduation. Some of the seeds we plant now fall on rocks or amid thorns, or on soil so thin that the plant withers away in the

heat of the sun. If the favorable period of cultivation be reduced from four years to two, we fear that our crops, in terms of our ideal, would be short indeed.

We are trying, of course, not to develop skills for specific vocations, but to fit men for happier and richer lives in whatever may be their calling. We are seeking to add something to the content of their minds, to familiarize them with many aspects of man's past, to enable them to understand and analyze many problems of the present and to work out standards of value for the future. We are interested not merely in the facts that store their minds, but the ability of our students to think, their understanding of scientific method, of philosophy, of the approaches special to the political scientist, the economist and the historian. Knowing that man cannot live by bread alone we seek to familiarize our students with some of the great literatures, and to develop an appreciation for art, for music, for the drama and for religion.

To those who bid us pattern our culture on the needs of the moment we reply that those needs are spiritual as well as vocational. Unemployment is no more ghastly a feature of the American scene than the rapid spread of intolerance. The mighty fleet that defends our shores offers no security against the invasion of racist doctrines from abroad, where leaders hostile to America's influence in the world seek to weaken and divide us by setting race against race and class against class. Our true Maginot line of defense against foreign propaganda rests on the intelligence of our people and is manned by our teachers. If we are to teach hatred of anything in a world already too full of hate, let it be hatred of intolerance, cruelty, class war and conquest.

Since our crop, moreover, can only be harvested by the students in whom we plant the seeds, we must take care that they assume their share of the tending, watering and developing. We must harp on the old truth that effective education means self-education and must therefore help the student to form habits of study that he will continue throughout life. Every subject we deal with should be presented with this in view. One of my correspondents has been naive enough to assume that if social sciences are taught, as they are after a fashion, in our secondary schools, a college which announced courses bearing the same labels stood

convicted of unnecessary repetition. To one who, like myself had studied, with Professor Conyers Read's committee, the rather sorry record of social science teaching in American secondary schools, the suggestion conveyed implications too grim to be funny. We should, it seems to me, go rather to the other extreme, and impress on our students the viewpoint that no course, whatever its place in the curriculum, is more than introductory. Lord Acton declared that no lecture was successful unless it stimulated its hearers to do more reading than they would otherwise have done. In the same sense let us make it clear that the value of our courses will largely depend on the extent to which our students will themselves carry the subject further. I do not mean by this that they must necessarily enrol later in a more advanced course in a graduate school, but that they should keep the subject in mind and increase their understanding of it by their own efforts in years to come.

So difficult is the task set for itself by the liberal arts college that it is small wonder that the space of four years seems short for its accomplishment. President Eliot once remarked that things went well at Harvard when a healthy spirit of pessimism prevailed in all departments. Truly we have no cause for smugness and an ever-present need to be up and doing. Real as are the advantages of a small college in permitting special adjustments to the needs of the individual student, they are not to be taken for granted. Many small colleges are less flexible in their treatment of undergraduates than a few universities. Mass production methods are so easy and so economical that there is a constant temptation to trade on the reputation of smallness, to assume its advantages without ensuring them and to offer their shadow rather than their substance. No efficiency engineer has been able to devise a modern production line which will turn out automatically, in large numbers, either a cultivated mind or a contrite heart.

So it behooves us to scrutinize our educational methods with something of the intense anxiety of New England Puritans of the seventeenth century. Their religion, as my friend Professor Perry Miller has well put it, "gave them no peace, it allowed them to make no shift with the merely good-enough, it permitted no relaxation because they had done their best." As they sought

anxiously for evidences of their true regeneration, let us in all humility test our procedures to see if they square with the liberal arts ideal.

Two of the best acid tests which can be applied by those who wish to know the real character of instruction in a college are to examine the variety and vitality of honors work in the upper-class years; and, at the other end of the scale, to inquire just how the college seeks to bridge the gap between itself and the secondary schools.

My task today, however, concerns itself rather with the gap between the liberal arts college and the university. About forty per cent of Williams seniors, in recent years, continue their studies in various graduate schools. Although we offer the opportunity for work leading to the M.A. degree, under rather severe restrictions, we make no effort to recruit candidates for this degree and on the contrary advise our students to pursue their graduate study at a university where they will have the competition and stimulus of a large group of fellow-candidates.

Of the forty per cent of our seniors who pursue graduate study, about one-third are in Law Schools, somewhat less than half are pretty evenly divided between Medical Schools and Graduate Schools of Business Administration and one-fifth attend Graduate Schools of Arts and Sciences. I have long felt that this latter figure, representing less than ten per cent of our graduates, was too low. Business and the law continue to skim most of the cream off the graduating classes in American colleges, and research and teaching attract too few of our ablest students.

According to the report of the Committee on Social Science Personnel of the Social Science Research Council in 1932 this phenomenon was especially marked in that branch of learning. "Of the top 10 to 15 per cent of five successive college graduating classes in fifteen institutions over a five-year period ending in 1931, only a fifth of those showing marked capacity in the social sciences chose teaching or research careers as against two-thirds of the natural science quota and a fourth of the humanities group. The fact that so small a proportion of social science honors students are entering the graduate school," this report continued, "is explained in large measure by the strong drawing power of law and business, these two fields capturing as many as 60 per

cent of the group." As a result the student personnel in our graduate schools is marked by "an excessive dilution of first-class with mediocre and inferior material."

One important factor in this problem is the meagreness of the financial aid available for the initial stages of graduate study. Such assistance as is offered is too slight to free the needy student from the prospect of having to finance himself in large part by further borrowing, by part-time teaching or by outside work detrimental to the progress of his studies. Few graduate schools offer more than free tuition at the first-year level. In the opinion of that committee, of which I was then serving as chairman, "there is no doubt that, the country over, a considerable number of college seniors of brilliant promise are lost to the research and teaching field because of the absence of first and second-year graduate fellowships sufficiently liberal in monetary value to finance an uninterrupted period of study. Once over this barrier, the majority of students who make good can be taken care of by the institution concerned; but as things now stand, the existence of a formidable initial hurdle undoubtedly causes many a promising youngster to turn to more immediately remunerative pursuits."

One of the most pressing needs of American higher education, to my mind, is the establishment of more fellowships to bridge the gap between the college and the graduate school. Williams, for example, has hitherto had only six scholarships which might be made available for seniors who desired to pursue graduate study in a university or in the National Institute of Public Affairs. A recent bequest, however, will permit us to offer one or perhaps two fellowships to seniors who have distinguished themselves in the field of music, with stipends fixed by the donor at the figure of three thousand dollars. It is a pleasure to report the generous action of the President and Trustees of Amherst College who for the past three years have opened one of the Amherst Memorial Fellowships to competition of seniors from Bowdoin, Wesleyan and Williams.

As all of us realize, there is room for much improvement in the integration of work at the undergraduate level with that of the graduate schools. In seeking this objective, however, it is important not to lose sight of the liberal arts ideal.

In order to facilitate the combination of a liberal arts course

with education in science and engineering, Massachusetts Institute of Technology and Williams College offer a combined five-year program leading to the Bachelor's degree from both institutions, where normally six years would be required. The student, in consultation with the deans of both institutions, may arrange to complete the requirements for a Williams B.A. and the requirements for a B.S. degree from Massachusetts Institute of Technology by a three-year course at Williams and a two-year course at the Institute. For students recommended under the plan who are majoring in mathematics and physics, the major requirements for the Williams degree are modified to the extent of waiving the senior course and the major examination. Only students of high standing will be recommended by Williams College for transfer to the Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

It was never contemplated by either of the two institutions concerned that more than a few students would avail themselves of this plan. Since it was announced in 1936 no student has yet made the transfer, though one presumably will do so this year and three more in 1941. Some of the men who have entered Williams with the intention of transferring to the Massachusetts Institute of Technology have failed to receive grades sufficiently high to warrant our recommending them. Others have become so much interested in our honors work program that they have decided to complete four years work with us before entering on their work at M. I. T. I should like to stress the point, which seems to me very important in such combined programs, that neither of the cooperating institutions assumed that the liberal arts ideal was to be discarded by the Williams junior when he embarked on his studies at the Institute. In his letter proposing the combined course President Compton pointed out that in his two years at M. I. T. the student "would naturally take, in addition to his strictly professional course, certain work in the social sciences and humanities."

Although the medical school records of our graduates have been on the whole very satisfactory and often distinguished, we are troubled by the tendency of our pre-medical students to concentrate too heavily in science courses. A brilliant graduate of the Class of 1935 who majored in English and received his B.A. degree *magna cum laude* took no more than the minimum amount of chemistry, physics and biology prescribed by the medical

schools. He was admitted to the school of his first choice, from which he recently graduated at the top of his class.

Men of lesser distinction, however, tend to pile science course on science course, in the belief that they will thereby improve their chances on the medical aptitude test and impress the admissions authorities by presenting an unusually extensive record of preparation in the natural sciences. This is not surprising in view of the keen competition for admission to our best medical schools. Yet it raises serious problems for the liberal arts college. As President Conant pointed out, in an address reprinted in the Association of American Colleges *BULLETIN* last November, this tendency gives cause for grave concern. "It is not," as he well says, "a question of doing well in the minimum prescribed courses in chemistry, physics and biology. It is not a question of taking more science either as an educational discipline or because the student likes the work. It is merely a question of taking scientific courses solely to impress the medical school authorities."

If the medical schools will clarify further their own desires, the situation will be helped. But is it too much to be hoped that they will give serious consideration to President Conant's interesting suggestion that college freshmen who are looking forward to a medical career be encouraged to apply for admission to a medical school three years in advance, and be rejected or accepted conditionally on the basis of their school record, on their record in freshman year and their performance in such tests as the scholastic aptitude test? It would then be possible for the medical school and the college to work out through a joint committee a satisfactory program to suit the student. It would be necessary of course to reserve a certain number of places in each first year medical class for students who decided late in their college career to study medicine. Most important of all is President Conant's suggestion that the medical school faculties give serious consideration to the ways and means of inspiring their students to continue their liberal education throughout their professional course. If they share our belief in the value of the liberal arts ideal they will seek to keep it alive in their students' minds so that the plant which has taken root in undergraduate days may grow and strengthen, and continue to bear fruit, not only in medical school days, but throughout a long life of service.

THE RELATIONS BETWEEN THE LIBERAL ARTS COLLEGE, THE JUNIOR COLLEGE AND THE PROFESSIONAL SCHOOL

BYRON S. HOLLINSHEAD

PRESIDENT, AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF JUNIOR COLLEGES.
PRESIDENT, SCRANTON-KEYSTONE JUNIOR COLLEGE

I SUSPECT that anyone representing the junior college before a college and university meeting in the East may have two strikes called when he marches to the plate. May I, therefore, do what I can at the outset to establish myself as a fairly respectable person. I took my secondary school work in one of our better-known eastern preparatory schools where I learned the answers to all the college board examinations for the previous ten years in the most approved fashion. Then I went to an old and conservative New England college belonging to what our sports writers on Sundays sometimes commiseratingly refer to as the Ivy League. Following that, I taught in a reasonably good university for about the same length of time as I have been "caretaker" at Scranton-Keystone Junior College. I say this not at all to impress you, but to indicate that neither by training nor by experience am I disposed to believe in "ham and eggs every Thursday," a chicken in every pot, two cars in every garage or a junior college for every town and hamlet.

My shift from university teaching to junior college administration was motivated by no higher ideal than the rather forlorn hope of having something left over from my salary check each month after the bills were paid. Once in the junior college field, however, it seemed highly important to discover what the junior college was, what it was attempting to do and in what directions it was moving. Because I had been in the university field, I was also interested in what the relations should be between the junior college, the liberal arts college and the professional school.

Before we consider what the relations between these institutions should be, may I at least partially answer the question of what the junior college is. Stated in the simplest possible terms, the junior college is two years of work beyond the high school on the college level. The education it offers takes two forms: the type we are most interested in today is preparatory—that is, two years

of work roughly paralleling the first two years of the four-year college, thus enabling the student to enter the junior year of the four-year college or university or go directly into such professional schools as dentistry, veterinary medicine and engineering. The other type is the two-year terminal course which may be either in the field of general education, or a specific training for one of the semi-professions or a combination of both.

There are many kinds of junior colleges—strong, mediocre and weak, just as there are many kinds of four-year colleges and universities. (My hope for the early demise of the ineffective and the proprietary junior college is as hearty as your wish for the early demise of the ineffective four-year college or university.) The typical junior college is offering its preparatory and semi-professional courses near the home of the student, so that many students, who might ordinarily have little opportunity for education beyond the high school, do have such an opportunity if a junior college is at hand. The need for this kind of opportunity is probably best illustrated by the Pennsylvania Study of the American Youth Commission. Of 30,000 high school students studied in Pennsylvania, the figures are as follows: "While 105 out of each 1,000 high school graduates went on to college and successfully completed the first two years, there were 174 out of each 1,000 who did not go to college, usually because they were financially unable to do so. *The 174 who did not go to college were found to have mental abilities that promised as high a degree of scholastic success as the 105 who did.*"¹

In other words, there are more students outside the college walls with the ability to do college work than there are in college. Small wonder that community junior colleges where they have been developed have been able to render a very significant service. To develop the potentialities of bright but impecunious students is one of the most valuable functions of the junior college.

The economic factor is at least partially responsible for the astonishing growth of the junior college. During the past ten years, the junior college has tripled in enrolment. Even New England now possesses thirty-one junior colleges where few could be found ten years ago. A recent report of the American Association of Collegiate Registrars shows that the increase in enrol-

¹ *Youth Tell Their Story*, Page 96, by Howard M. Bell; American Council on Education.

ment in junior colleges last year was 21.3 per cent while the enrolment in universities had increased 4.6 per cent.²

Is there a danger in this rapid growth and does it constitute any kind of threat to the stability of well-established four-year colleges and universities? I do not think so. The figures I have given from the Pennsylvania Study indicate that our present collegiate system is not serving at least half those who have the ability to profit from collegiate education. The junior college, by and large, is serving an entirely new group.

Further, a recent study³ made by J. L. Lounsbury in California indicated that junior colleges were helping rather than impeding the growth of four-year colleges. Certainly in California, if anywhere, the effect on the enrolment of other colleges would be most harmful. The opposite was the case. The colleges studied include Stanford University, University of Southern California, Pomona College, University of California at Berkeley, College of the Pacific, Occidental College and the University of Santa Clara. In 1934, these seven colleges had a student enrolment in their lower divisions of 9,024 and in their upper divisions of 10,224. In 1938, the same institutions had an enrolment of 10,964 in their lower divisions and an enrolment of 12,344 in their upper divisions. The lower division enrolments had enjoyed a normal increase and the upper divisions had a considerably above normal increase. This study, it seems to me, indicates quite definitely that junior colleges aid materially the enrolments of well-established senior colleges.

But what will be the effect of junior colleges on the weak four-year colleges and universities? The existence of the weak four-year colleges is unquestionably threatened but not by the junior college. More than most of us realize the weak four-year college is already very largely serving as a junior college. A majority of the students who enter as freshmen have left by the end of the sophomore year. Transfers to stronger institutions account for a large part of this loss, in some cases amounting to as much as 46 per cent of the student body by the end of the sophomore year.

² Special Supplement, October, 1939, *Journal of the American Association of Collegiate Registrars*. Report by Fred L. Kerr, Registrar, University of Arkansas.

³ The study is summarized in *The Junior College Journal*, December, 1939, Page 208.

Since such institutions also lose about fifty per cent of their enrolments by the end of the sophomore year for reasons other than transfer, they are for all practical purposes junior colleges now and would vastly strengthen their own programs if they would so acknowledge themselves. No one with an interest in our general educational welfare would regret this change, though it doubtless would be accompanied by some local hardship.

Why some institutions strive so eagerly to hold on to the number four when they ought to be thinking in terms of time required for a particular curriculum or in terms of student needs, is beyond explanation. The magic of the number four was probably best explained by President Wilkins, of Oberlin College, in addressing the Association of American Universities in 1926. Dr. Wilkins said :

"The reason why we have a four-year college in America today is that the first American institution of higher learning, Harvard, took form in the seventeenth century as a four-year college.

"The reason why Harvard in the seventeenth century took form as a four-year college is presumably that the University of Cambridge in the seventeenth century required a four-year course for the bachelor's degree. . . .

"The reason why the University of Cambridge originally required a four-year course for the bachelor's degree is presumably that the University of Oxford required a four-year course for the bachelor's degree.

"The reason why the University of Oxford originally required a four-year course for the bachelor's degree is presumably that the students of the English nation at the University of Paris followed such a course. A statute of that nation, adopted in February, 1252, specifies that the candidate for the bachelor's degree '*fidem faciet . . . quod audierit in artibus per quinque annos vel quatuor ad minus.*'

"The ultimate reason why we have a four-year college in America today is then presumably that the students of the English nation at the University of Paris in the thirteenth century followed a course of four years as a minimum for the bachelor's degree.

"Naturally, the content of the course has changed completely. . . . Yet with all the changes wrought in the curriculum, the

four-year mould has been kept as sacrosanct. It would seem to be unworthy of the spirit of modern America longer to be bound by an educational form devised to meet conditions which obtained in Europe in the thirteenth century.

"It is, of course, perfectly true that an ancient form might by a combination of chances remain appropriate under changed conditions. If the four-year college is thus appropriate, well and good. If not, it should be recognized as vestigial, and should in general make way for a more modern type of educational organization.

"In point of fact the four-year college reveals no peculiar adaptation to our present needs. On the contrary, it is betraying more and more clearly the truth that it no longer constitutes a normal educational unit."⁴

To discover the soundness of a two-year training for many semi-professional fields, the American Association of Junior Colleges has just begun a study in the field of junior college terminal work subsidized by the General Education Board. Many of us anticipate that we shall find a great number of semi-professions, not now being trained for at all, which can be adequately prepared for in a period of two years. Our problem at present is that industry does not want young people in its employ until they reach about age twenty. Since the old apprentice system, extending from bricklayer's helper to lawyer's clerk, has gone, we must provide a substitute for apprenticeship in the schools and colleges. The dangers consist of too short vocational courses which do not produce better citizens, on the one hand, and too long professional courses on the other. I suppose President Rappleye has an answer for it, but I am bothered by the fact that the medical student, for example, must spend four years in college, four in medical school, two as an interne in a hospital and then two or three years in getting started. He has a race to see whether he will find his first fee-paying patient before he is forced to retire by the operation of one of the old age pension plans. In the meantime, he must forego all possibility of being a normal citizen.

⁴ Wilkins, E. H., *The Relation of the Senior College and the Graduate School*, in *Journal of the Proceedings and Addresses of the Twenty-Eighth Annual Conference of the Association of American Universities*, pp. 59-60. Chicago, 1926.

We must, in some way, lengthen the period of formal education for some and shorten it for others. For an enormous number of young people the best hope would seem to lie in two-year semi-professional courses which combine general education with a training in specific skills.

In developing their programs, junior colleges greatly need the help and guidance of senior colleges and universities. However, the senior institutions should avoid trying to force junior colleges to give courses paralleling minutely the courses they themselves give. Junior Colleges can never work out their programs successfully if they try to offer work paralleling exactly the work of a dozen or more universities in their lower divisions. I am speaking now of the liberal arts course, not of engineering or pre-professional curricula.

May I give an illustration to make my point clear. One of our honor students at Scranton-Keystone some years ago wanted to go to a large middle western university to take a major in statistics. He was very acceptable to the institution except that he had had economics in his freshman year with us and the registrar insisted that unless economics were taken in the sophomore year no credit could be given. Few registrars take that attitude today, but the case is illustrative of an over-regard for minutiae and a disregard for the important fact that the boy was an honor student.

My suggestion is that when a four-year college or university is considering a junior college student on a transfer basis, it should first consider the junior college in which he has had his training. Then the university should consider the student. If he is a good student, and the junior college will recommend him, he will almost certainly do well in the university even though his courses may not have paralleled the work of its lower division exactly. Many studies indicate the truth of this statement. The most recent study I know about was conducted by the college examiner⁵ of the Pennsylvania State College. He found that 56 per cent of the students admitted to Penn State from secondary schools graduated four years later with their classes. Seventy-three per cent of those admitted from junior colleges graduated with their classes. In proportion to their numbers, junior college

⁵ Unpublished study by Dr. C. E. Marquardt, College Examiner, The Pennsylvania State College. Figures given are contained in a letter from Dr. Marquardt to the writer.

students at the Pennsylvania State College received twice as many academic honors in their senior year as those who had entered from secondary schools. This is no reflection on the secondary schools and not particularly to the credit of the junior colleges. The junior college serves a very definite try-out function and those who go on from it to the university are a selected group.

What, then, should the relationship be between the junior college and the university? I think the answer to this is to be partly found in an analysis of the type of students who should go to a junior college as differentiated from those who should go to a university. While I do not feel competent to set up any rigid classification, it seems to me that students who are young or immature and therefore need to have home influences prolonged should go to a junior college. Bright but impecunious students need to go to a junior college because of economic necessity. Students undecided about their fields of interest will probably get better guidance and have more chance for a try-out in the junior college. If they find they have little ability for academic work, they can stop honorably at the end of two years; if they discover that they do have academic ability, they can go on to the university with the assurance that their time and money will be well spent. Students who have taken the wrong curriculum in high school can make up their deficiencies more readily in a junior college, because most junior colleges offer some secondary school work. For example, a student who has taken a science curriculum in high school and has not taken a modern language can make up this deficiency in a junior college and carry some college work at the same time. Students should go to a junior college if their vocational interests lie in one of the semi-professional fields, such as medical, secretarial, general business, some types of civil service, agriculture, engineering technician, etc., for which two years of training is ample.

Students should go directly to a university if they know exactly what they want to do. Students who have the time and money for four years of general education should go to certain types of well-established four-year colleges. Students who want to take curricula in which specializing begins in the lower division such as forestry, agriculture and home economics, should go directly to the university. Mature students who want to take specialized

courses, but who may not wish to go through the formality of the general requirements of the lower division, should go directly to the university.

In going over the enrolment at Scranton-Keystone Junior College, I find that about five per cent of our total enrolment has been recommended to us by some senior college or university whose registrars felt that for the particular needs of those students a junior college would serve better than a senior institution. In going over the correspondence of the Scranton-Keystone registrar's office of the past summer, I find that we advised about twenty-five prospective applicants for admission that they would be wiser to go directly to a university. In general, students recommended to us by senior institutions belonged to one of the classifications I have enumerated for junior college students. Students we recommended to go elsewhere classified in the university group. This would seem to indicate that the kind of differentiation of students I have spoken of is already in progress and that junior colleges and senior colleges supplement each other but are not competitive institutions.

Another function the junior college ought to serve is in guiding its graduates to four-year colleges or universities which offer a really significant major in the field in which the student is interested. At Scranton-Keystone we made up a list some years ago of institutions to which we thought students should go if they were interested in certain fields. Most senior colleges do not offer really significant majors in very many fields. If the student who goes on from a junior college is guided to an institution which meets his needs, the junior college has done him a real service. Frequently, a student entering a four-year college and expecting to major in a certain academic field does not discover until later that the institution he has entered does not offer strong work in that specialty.

Many four-year colleges, it seems to me, might well begin to think of three-year programs above the lower division leading to the master's degree. Colleges of engineering might well offer a program leading to the professional degree in engineering rather than to the bachelor's degree and constituting a five-year course. Lehigh University is already doing this. For universities already divided into upper and lower divisions, the junior

college student constitutes no problem, if they accept him on the basis of his ability as a student and not by a rigid insistence on paralleling courses. (The published policy of Stanford University is admirable on this point.)

May I summarize the foregoing by a series of completely unadorned statements. The junior college is reaching a group of students, many with high ability, not previously served by American higher education. Strong four-year colleges and universities will be benefited by the junior college. Many weak four-year colleges should become junior colleges. Weak and proprietary junior colleges should have neither your interest nor your help. The development of semi-professional courses of two years' duration should be encouraged. There is no magic in the number four and all of us should think instead of mastery and student needs. We must prolong formal education for some and shorten it for others. Students who should go to junior colleges may be differentiated from those who should go to senior institutions. Finally, junior colleges and senior colleges are or should be supplementary and cooperating rather than competitive institutions.

RELATIONSHIP OF COLLEGE TO MEDICAL EDUCATION

WILLARD C. RAPPLEYE, M.D.

PRESIDENT, ADVISORY COUNCIL ON MEDICAL EDUCATION

DEAN, FACULTY OF MEDICINE, COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

A DISCUSSION of the relationships of professional and general education must concern itself with the objectives of the former and the principles of education which should guide both. One of the encouraging signs of the moment is the growing appreciation that the educational process is continuous from earliest childhood to old age, although it is recognized that the degree of development and the period at which it slows down or terminates vary greatly with different individuals. Learning must be regarded as one of the essential and characteristic functions of life itself. As such it can be artificially subdivided and treated in detached compartments only with risk to its integrity and to its continuity. That education is now suffering from such arbitrary fragmentation is all too apparent, but fortunately it has within itself large powers of adjustment and compensation to external distortion.

The purposes of medical education include the recruitment and training of a sufficient number of competent physicians of different categories to provide adequate medical care for the population of the country. Reference need only be made to the many new discoveries in different fields of science which have a bearing upon health or the diagnosis, treatment and prevention of disease to emphasize the need of many different kinds of skill and knowledge for satisfactory medical care for individuals, families and communities. The volume of such knowledge and the technical skills required are far beyond the capacity of any individual to master, hence the need in any adequate program of public health and medical care of a wide variety of different types of personnel and preparation.

Conditions of living are recognized as vital elements in health and in their contributions to disease, disability, treatment and prevention. Physicians and others responsible for health activities and medical care should understand the social and environmental factors as they bear upon the health problems of the individual

and his family, if they are to deal intelligently with such questions. Even with such understanding there are many problems which can be dealt with satisfactorily only through broad social programs. There is an awakening sense of responsibility on the part of the public, medical education, and the profession that reasonably adequate medical care should be provided to every group of the population, geographic as well as economic.

These questions are directly related to the responsibilities of universities, colleges and medical schools in the selection and preparation of medical students. If the unit of education is the student, our concern should be the qualifications of each individual and the opportunities by which he may equip himself to meet the responsibilities and to deal satisfactorily with those situations and problems which will confront him in whatever professional capacity he may function later in his career. This attitude does not emphasize standardized courses of instruction, prescribed uniform subject matter, identical length of preparation or even a single student pattern. Rather, it calls for flexibility in selection and preparation adapted to the diversified needs of modern medicine on the one hand and to the special interests, aptitudes and abilities of individual students on the other.

It is well to pause a moment to register the fact that the regulation, rigidity and uniformity in pre-professional education and the overemphasis on preparation in the sciences has arisen in the medical schools, professional and licensing bodies and not in the colleges and universities. There is now agreement that the process has been overdone, necessary as it was earlier to bring medical education to its present high standard in this country.

Inasmuch as the true success of a physician and the public as well as the professional repute in which he is held is determined by his character, personality, industry, initiative, resourcefulness, judgment and native ability, quite as much as by his technical skill and knowledge, the selection of students for medical study should be based on these qualities. The length or subject matter of his college preparation is, within certain limits, relatively unimportant.

The college preparation for medical studies should be devoted to general rather than largely science education. It is common knowledge that many students, hopeful of getting into a medical

school and often under advice, take a maximum amount of work in the sciences in order to improve their chances of getting into a medical school, not because they want to study or even like the sciences particularly. Students applying for admission to medical schools should be selected on the basis of those qualities mentioned above, so far as they can be evaluated, and upon evidence of capacity for intellectual growth, self-reliance, achievement and maturity, all of which have little relationship to age or subjects taken. Students without these qualities have difficulty in adjusting themselves to the serious demands of the professional disciplines and the considerable degree of individualized instruction in the better medical schools. Increasingly the medical schools are requiring that the student under supervision "learn by doing," in contrast with the earlier emphasis on didactic or demonstration teaching by the faculty. This shift in emphasis is designed to develop self-reliance, judgment and sound habits as well as methods of study in each student which will equip him to meet the demands of practice as well as to serve as a foundation for his own self-education throughout his professional career.

The only college subjects in which every medical student needs some basic knowledge are chemistry, biology and physics. They serve as an introduction to scientific methods and thought and, when well presented, provide the elementary tools of objective, quantitative study now so important in every medical field.

The length and cost of medical education in its entirety present some real problems for students, hospitals and universities. They are receiving fresh emphasis because of the requirements for the clinical specialties beginning in 1942, at which time the standards of the specialty boards and the Advisory Board for Medical Specialties are scheduled to become effective. After that date specialists will be qualified only following completion of a three-year hospital residency subsequent to an internship. The minimum period of training for a specialized field of practice will be eight years, comprising the four year medical course, an internship of at least one year and not less than three years of a hospital residency. Many graduates now take as much or longer time before starting independent practice. It is generally agreed that the responsibilities of real specialists require that amount of preparation in the public interest.

Several suggestions designed to allow students to complete their formal education earlier have been made. The mean age at which physicians graduate is higher than in most other countries although that figure has not increased in recent years. The lengthening periods of hospital experience are elevating further the age at which the young physician begins practice. This is due in part to present economic conditions and the over crowding of the profession which makes a start in practice increasingly difficult. Many recent graduates remain in hospital services rather than venture into practice.

One suggestion is to shorten the medical course but the total content can not be given in less time with safety. Time is a necessary element in the maturation of every student. If condensation of schedules is to be proposed it would be better to put it into effect elsewhere than in the period of basic professional training which forms the foundation for the physician's entire career. It must be borne in mind that the medical course is shorter in the United States than in any other country where medical education is regarded as satisfactory. Adequate preparation for general or special practice is a requisite for proper medical care for the population. Compromise with sound standards is unwise and unnecessary. On the other hand, the prolongation of professional training beyond a reasonable length has the danger of stifling creative ability, enthusiasm and intellectual independence, a definite hazard now recognized in some of the graduate requirements.

Another suggestion is to reduce the period of college education preceding medical studies. An extreme proposal which is not likely to receive serious attention is that the college period should be eliminated and that medical students should be admitted directly from secondary schools. This plan was in existence a generation ago in this country and was abandoned in the evolution of present day standards of medical education because of the inadequacies of the secondary schools.

The necessity of a serious intellectual background for the demanding disciplines of medicine was recognized as essential in the program to elevate the standards of medical education begun about 1900 in this country. As early as 1910, 28 medical schools had adopted a minimum requirement of two years of college work for admission. In 1918, 81 of the 90 schools had adopted that

standard. 93.4% of 12,131 applicants in 1938 had three years or more of college and 65% of the medical graduates had baccalaureate degrees. Many medical schools have inserted different demands above the minimum requirements and have made it difficult for a single college to satisfy the regulations of any considerable number of medical schools. A student would need more than the usual four years of college study to satisfy the entrance requirements of all of the medical schools, including the subjects each recommends as desirable but which, in the selection of students from the large number of applicants, often have the same force as requirements.

Without discussing the position of the American College in the scheme of education, with its emphasis too often upon teaching and numbers of students rather than scholarship, it is worthy of note, partly in connection with the figures just quoted, that the enrolment in institutions of so-called higher education has increased about 1100 per cent during the last 40 years, during which period the population has approximately doubled. There are now three times as many students in these institutions as were in the secondary schools at the turn of the century. A college education has now become the accepted desirable base for general education and as a preparation for professional or advanced training. If the physician is to continue to be the health leader and adviser in his community he must have as broad a basic education as his associates in other community activities.

A closer cooperation between the medical schools and colleges, particularly in eliminating required subjects except for a preparation in the three basic sciences and in selecting students on their individual qualifications, would help greatly in integrating medical with general education. Telescoping to some degree the medical and college course, with earlier selection of students and collaboration in subject matter, has been suggested by numerous commentators in the past to help the situation. While this may be done in local situations there would be practical difficulties and no real necessity of correlating the efforts of the 800 or more colleges from which medical students come with the 77 medical schools, some of which have applicants each year from 150 or more colleges. Nevertheless, a sound policy of medical school admissions now under consideration by the members of the Advisory

Council on Medical Education, and proper emphasis on the purpose of college preparation as that of general education, would largely correct the existing confusion without introducing new problems.

Speaking of the numbers of applications for admission to medical schools, the figures are misleading because many students apply to anywhere from 2 to 35 or more schools. In spite of the large numbers of applicants a number of medical schools accept some students without entirely acceptable qualifications. Those of superior qualifications and preparation have no difficulty getting into one or another of the best medical schools. What many medical schools are seeking for the record is some automatic or objective basis for rejection of unsuitable candidates. At present the records of achievement in those colleges whose standards are known and the recommendations of instructors and advisers who know the students and whose comments and recommendations have been known in the past to be reliable afford, with the personal interview, a basis of selection which is quite satisfactory. Many should be discouraged as early as possible in their college training from attempting to study medicine. For a number of understandable reasons, however, college advisers are reluctant to take the responsibility of urging students to give up their ambition to become physicians, even if they could persuade them, partly because they do not know just what individual medical schools regard as the most desirable qualifications.

The answer to be sought is an improvement in the objectives and effectiveness of college preparation. It is recognized that many of the defects in this segment of education are traceable to the inadequacies and defects in secondary education which too often fails to equip pupils with the sound rudiments of education and continues to consume a longer time than necessary. The first year or two of college is often devoted to instruction at a secondary school level. The reorganization of elementary and secondary education and of college courses and the stimulation of better scholarship would bring students to the professional schools at least several years earlier and better prepared. It is appreciated that efforts in these directions are being made and that the evolution of higher education will be a gradual process.

No generalization regarding science teaching in the colleges is

possible because of the wide variations between institutions. In many the preparation is excellent, in others the science instruction suffers from the same defects as other college teaching. Students of ability who have a good preparation under inspiring, capable teachers do well in the early years of the medical course and, on that foundation, almost always do satisfactory work throughout the clinical and hospital years.

The motivation in the preliminary sciences is probably more important than the amount of time and content of those subjects. Much of the science teaching is presented from the viewpoint of the special interests of the particular teacher or department. Valuable material for the illustration of underlying principles of chemistry and the demonstration of methods can be found in such general fields as nutrition and biology, as examples. Physics is taught in many places largely in relation to engineering. Biology too frequently is presented as topics in classification of interest to the specialist in that field, rather than as subject dealing with the life processes of cells and simpler organisms. These subjects often are arranged for the needs of neither general education nor preparation for medicine. In many instances the attempt is made to teach too much in too great detail and in too specialized a manner. It is hoped that cooperation between the medical and college groups should make it possible to greatly simplify and strengthen the subject instruction. Such a plan is now under discussion in the Advisory Council on Medical Education. It is not more but a different type of science teaching that is required for purposes of both general education and the preparation for medical studies.

The college preparation should not be regarded as preprofessional or pre-anything but the culmination of general education. The colleges and universities should be permitted to serve that objective with a minimum of interference or regulation by outside bodies. The selection of students for medical studies should and progressively will be made on the basis of the qualifications of the individual regardless of the length or subject matter of his earlier instruction, except for the necessary evidence of an understanding of the elementary sciences upon which medical studies are based.

The need of dealing in some effective way with the entire sequence of medical education and in order to coordinate the efforts of the many agencies now regulating or concerned with the

different subdivisions of that field, an Advisory Council on Medical Education has been created on the initiative of the Association of American Medical Colleges. It is the first agency in the country for this purpose which is representative of the various groups directly concerned with the education and licensure of physicians. The Council comprises 13 national organizations representing the colleges, universities, medical schools, licensing bodies, hospitals and professional bodies. On the question presented today that Council will act next month on a resolution as follows:

"Recognizing the widening public, cultural, and educational interests of medicine, the Advisory Council on Medical Education recommends to the Association of American Medical Colleges, the Association of American Universities and the Association of American Colleges that the college preparation for medical studies above the necessary grasp of the fundamental principles of biology, physics and chemistry should be devoted to general education rather than additional forms of preprofessional education."

In keeping with the proposal cited, steps will be taken promptly through the national organizations of medical schools, licensing boards, colleges and universities to urge the adoption of this policy. Through a cooperative representative agency of this type it is hoped that a better appreciation of the interdependence of the different phases of medical education can be obtained on the part of colleges, medical schools, hospitals and the licensing and professional bodies and that emphasis will be placed on true educational principles and standards in the selection of students and the conduct of the professional education at its several levels. While these comments apply specifically to medical education they are equally applicable to every form of higher education based upon preparation in the liberal arts colleges.

REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN COLLEGES

META GLASS

AS your president for 1939 I have no facts to report to you that you have not already learned in the BULLETIN, in the reports of the Treasurer and the Director or that you will not learn from the commission reports that follow. Something of the spirit of your Board of Directors and the emphases within the wider field of college concern I may be able to bring you.

The spirit of the Board has seemed to me one of striking eagerness to understand both the proposals that have come before it and the implications of those proposals in a straight-forward, open-minded fashion. Hurried action by a board of pressed persons met in a specific city for a limited time is not unnatural. Your Board this year has seemed to me distinctly to resist this urge; it has postponed matters, prolonged meetings and reconvened to avoid what might be action on meagre knowledge or meagre consideration. It has summoned additional persons to sit in on discussions and assist with special knowledge wherever special knowledge was at its disposal. You have had a hard working and a conscientious board, whatever have been its accomplishments or its failures.

The program of this meeting indicates the emphases that have been uppermost through the year. We have been concerned with colleges and what they do, how to discriminate between them, and how best the various kinds complement each other as well as how they complement secondary schools.

We have been concerned with teachers and how they may be helped by education and training to be good ones; and we have been concerned with provisions by which they may be helped to stay good ones on the job, free and unharrassed enough to grow.

We have taken on concern over our own public relations as a group, because the currents of present day life and governmental activity involve us largely by groups in public action and therefore call forth group consciousness.

There has been emphasized concern with the world we live in and an eagerness to meet the responsibility of the educated and

educating groups in finding ways to make right relations prevail in this world.

We have been much concerned with the freedom of the spirit, in proportion as it is menaced, for the sake of what only the free spirit produces and therefore with the free college that it may be the effective college.

I have what might be called a mandate from six college presidents that when speaking to you I should discuss "What is free speech on a college campus in a time of hysteria?" I am not at home in hysteria. I am afraid of my adequacy with such a mandate. Maybe I had better be guided by the request of the program chairman of the Colonial Dames to a prospective speaker "to talk about colonial heroes of Virginia, touching on Magna Carta." This offers a fine chance to found William and Mary over again and bring in Jefferson and all his conceptions of freedom, academic and otherwise. And when it comes to touching on Magna Carta I wonder if it would be difficult to draw the parallels between John and the barons and the college administrator and the college professor. If I remember aright, the most the barons wanted was to have John state what he would do and stand by it. I believe this group is going to be urged almost immediately to do just that, and I can hardly think it will refuse.

Yes, The Colonial Heroes and the Magna Carta seems the safest topic, if the touching habit can be extended to cover one phase over which I have especial concern. It is difficult to state this aspect without dangerous shadows from its emphasis, but I care enough about it to try. We are being increasingly called upon to discern that fine line between organized action and freedom that will promote justice and still allow enough flexibility for self-guided right action. It is the great problem of our time in all corporate spheres I think, but it hits the educational world in a peculiar way. From the founding of universities the long-standing background of teachers has been a tradition of service and freedom. They have existed primarily to serve and, since they have been credited with knowing, they have been long free to guide their service, and wherever teachers have operated in groups, the group decision has been upon the free expression of judgment by its members. The fact that the teaching group had administrative officers in no way lessened this, since the admin-

istrator was one of the group chosen to coordinate and facilitate the carrying out of the various decisions of the different members in any unit.

A new attitude has crept into this relation, by analogy with business in an age when business has had a specious glamor; partly by imitation of efficient methods, evolved for a group with no such traditional background as teachers have had; partly by choosing persons without that traditional background to be school executives. In all public speaking—and perhaps in thinking—the terminology of the class struggle gets itself used even in discussions of inanimate things and of aesthetic concerns as well as in social, political and economic matters. If the use is thoughtless, educators ought to be the last persons to use this language. If the use corresponds to the thought, some clear and penetrating testing of our thoughts is in order.

Schools and colleges are intrinsically cooperatives, at their best when unified by a common conception of service and a spontaneous tolerance by the members of themselves and of each other. You may say a highly idealistic picture, but I say, nevertheless, one strikingly near realization in countless groups over many centuries. It furnishes something that is of high value, perilously near loss on a contract basis.

I am inclined to think that imitation of business and labor ideology is more responsible for the present trend than the choice of administrators. I was able to find in *Who's Who* the previous condition of servitude of only four hundred and sixty-four executives of the five hundred and forty-nine colleges listed as members of this association in March of 1939. Of these four hundred and sixty-four, two hundred and seventy-one had been teachers, thirty-nine teachers and ministers, one hundred ministers rather than teachers and only fifty-four had come from other activities: business men, army officers, editors and association secretaries and directors. Still college executives are overwhelmingly professors and as such, should have the same ideals as other professors. Their attitudes might be less personalized by the necessity of thinking for the whole institution instead of thinking for self, department or field only; but the tradition of which I speak and which I value so highly would seem to be a part of the mental furnishing of college executives if it is of college professors.

Perhaps our extended higher education has brought into the

number of both college professors and college executives many persons who have had strikingly other traditions, whose attitudes have been formed in childhood by other family and social ideas. Would we not do well to imbue such persons, as a part of their training when they turn to education as a life work, with the traditional ideal of service which is freedom, rather than lose this tradition and turn to the position of bargaining as if education operated on the profit motive?

What I say of professor-executives ought, it seems to me, to be true of minister-executives. Certainly their training has been in a calling with the tradition of service *par excellence*, one entirely removed from the profit motive. It is as important that education stay removed from it as that the ministry be so.

None of us would be so indiscreet as to deny that there are encroachments due to the profit motive operating in some educational institutions today, as well as unwise and unskillful executives, and this unwisdom and lack of skill works to the injury of professors in these colleges. How must institutions, the really important educational units, be protected from such executives? Must we trust to a code agreed upon as if between labor and capital in a group which society has a right to expect to have arrived at intelligent cooperation on as nearly an unselfish basis as human beings can attain? If this is the only way, then there is one more disappointment with education. Is not our association, where each institution is represented by its executive officer or at least one of the highly responsible officers if from a large university, the place to define, make widely known, yes, inculcate this ideal of cooperative responsibility between executive and teacher, the place so to educate college executives that they will be able to teach the same thing on their own campuses? Surely it would be a constructive piece of work, to be done in one way or another over again, not as often as things have to be done over in colleges, but sufficiently often to keep the tradition alive in the changing ranks of executives, so patently alive that there would be no demand for industry's methods of collective bargaining, wages and hours acts, all the regulations to secure justice in opposing interests. There are no opposing interests in a truly educational effort, only jointly and considerately to practice the art. Can this association help to keep it an art and not let it become an industry?

THE REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

GUY E. SNAVELY

THIS year, the first in the second quarter century of the life of the Association, has witnessed more than the usual amount of activity in the work of the Board of Directors and the various Commissions of the Association. The Board has held six meetings. Two of these have been joint meetings with Commissions. The joint meeting with the Commission on Public Relations was held in Washington on March 7, 1939: the other joint meeting was held with the Commission on Academic Freedom and Academic Tenure in New York on December 3.

It was voted at the last-mentioned meeting to request another joint conference with the committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure of the American Association of University Professors to be convened before our annual meeting now in session. With all members present at this joint meeting except President Bird of the Board of Directors and Dean Wittke of the Commission, it was unanimously agreed that the joint report of the two commissions of the Association of American Colleges and the American Association of University Professors, which was debated at considerable length at our last Annual Meeting, should be amended in three particulars:

(1) The last sentence in the third paragraph of the report should read: "freedom and economic security, hence tenure, are indispensable to the success of an institution in fulfilling its obligations to its students and to society." It read in the original report: "Upon freedom and economic security, and hence upon tenure, depends the success of an institution in fulfilling its obligations to its students and to society."

(2) The last sentence in paragraph (c) under Academic Freedom should be deleted. This sentence reads: "The judgment of what constitutes fulfillment of these obligations should rest with the individual."

(3) The paragraph referring to the six-year period of probation with tenure thereafter should be redrafted in such terms that the principle of apprenticeship or probation be recognized but that each institution set and announce its own period, which should be as brief as possible. It is conceivable that a maximum figure might be agreed upon.

Chairman Wriston of the Commission will make other recommendations in his report.

On March 3 and October 30, the Commission on the Arts held very well attended and interesting sessions in the office of the Association. The Commission held a third session last evening. Chairman Fitzgerald will report for the Commission later today.

Chairman Harry M. Gage of the Commission on Teacher Education has been alert to the duties of his commission throughout the year. He has attended conferences on the problem held by other groups which are also greatly interested and are making studies in the field of teacher education. A meeting of this commission was held here in Philadelphia last evening. A report of the commission's activities will be made by Chairman Gage later in this annual meeting.

The new Commission on Public Relations, established this year under the authorization of the last Annual Meeting, has functioned exceedingly well. It held two meetings in the Association office and four meetings in Washington. As *ex officio* member of the Commission, the Executive Director kept the record of its meetings and acted on several occasions as its representative before Congressional committees and with other groups and persons. The most effective work of the committee was the use of its influence in defeating the proposal to include colleges and universities in the operation of the Social Security Act under the title of unemployment compensation. A letter from the Under Secretary of the U. S. Treasury, John W. Hanes, indicates appreciation of the visit of the Commission to his office and of the commission's favorable attitude toward the maintenance of the fifteen per cent exemption for gifts to educational and other charitable interests in the Federal Income Tax Law, also the Commission's desire to improve the interpretation of the present Federal Estate Tax Laws. More details of the work of this Commission will be outlined in the report of Chairman Gaines.

Chairman Weld of the Committee on Insurance and Annuities was unusually active during the year in developing plans that the colleges might adopt in this field. Obviously his plans were disturbed by the debate on the possibility of including colleges and universities under the Social Security Act. He will give in his report the recommendations of his Committee.

To the persons appointed presidents of member colleges during the year, we have sent the customary letter concerning the Association's policy on academic freedom and academic tenure.

We hope and believe these letters tend to prevent misunderstandings between faculty members and college administrative officers.

Considerable time and thought have been required in service on committees of various national boards and organizations. With President Thurman D. Kitchin of Wake Forest College, I have represented the Association on the Advisory Council on Medical Education. This council is recommending a liberalization of requirements for admission to medical schools.

As a member of the Committee on Financial and Fiduciary matters of the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America, and of its subcommittee on Annuities, I have been in attendance upon a number of meetings. The Committee on Annuities is concerned with the procedure of securing annuity gifts, and the rates in vogue, especially in connection with the recently adopted Insurance Law of New York State.

As a member of the University Christian Mission, affiliated with the Federal Council, I have been interested to note the fine responses on the part of students in the larger universities to programs arranged for visitations of outstanding Christian leaders. These missions have lasted usually a week on each campus visited.

In mid-summer, I was the Association's representative with a group of five or six others representing other college and university associations at a meeting held at the United States Office of Education to formulate preliminary plans for the several large conferences called by the United States Department of State to stimulate improvement of cultural relations with the Latin-American countries.

It has been a privilege to continue as Chairman of the Board of Directors of the Scholarship Department of the Presser Foundation.

During the past year I have had the high privilege of visiting 59 colleges in 18 states. At 11 of these I made addresses.

My cordial thanks are due the members of the Board of Directors and of the various commissions who have been most cooperative and generous in contribution of time and advice. President Glass has been unusually helpful. She has responded promptly to every call by letter, telegram and long distance telephone. Her presidency has been a real contribution to the life of the Association.

REPORT OF BOARD OF DIRECTORS

THE Board of Directors has held six meetings during the past year. The meeting on March 7 was held in Washington in conjunction with the Commission on Public Relations. Meetings in the Association office were held on January 26, April 28 and October 7. On December 2 a joint meeting with the Commission on Academic Freedom and Academic Tenure was held at the Town Hall Club in New York City. A meeting was held last evening here in Philadelphia. All of these meetings were well attended by the Board members.

Most of the actions taken at these meetings have been mentioned in the report of the Executive Director and have been outlined in some detail in the ten letters sent out to each member college from the Association office during the past year.

Formal approval of the various recommendations made by the Board of Directors will be given by the adoption of this report.

The Board accepted with cordial thanks a grant of \$33,750 from the Carnegie Corporation to support through a period of five years "a professorship for temporary residence at four-year liberal arts colleges" with Doctor Everett Dean Martin as the incumbent.

The Board accepted also an additional grant of \$54,000 from the Carnegie Corporation to be used toward the extension of the Association program in the Arts, \$18,000 to be paid annually for the three years beginning May 1, 1939. This is a continuation of a previous three-year grant for the Concert Project made by the Carnegie Corporation.

Arrangements were completed with the American Library Association for the publication and distribution of *TEACHING WITH BOOKS*, written by Doctor Harvie Branscomb, who directed the Library Project, which was financed by the Carnegie Corporation. Each member college is to receive *gratis* a copy of Doctor Branscomb's book.

Executive Director Emeritus Robert L. Kelly was voted by the Board an appropriation of \$1,600 for additional clerical help in the completion of his book on "The American Colleges and the Social Order." This publication is the result of a two-year study made possible by a grant from the Carnegie Corporation.

In order to fulfill the requirements for Doctor Kelly's retirement annuity agreed upon at the time of his withdrawal from office, the board appropriated an additional sum of \$1,170.56 to the Teachers Insurance and Annuity Association of America.

On the recommendation of the Commission on Public Relations, a resolution was adopted by the Board indicating opposition to the bills in the last Congress proposing Federal grants in the realm of higher education.

By virtue of the articles of incorporation of the Association, it is necessary to have an association seal. The Board selected from a number submitted by a New York artist a seal which will be used on official documents of the Association and appear on the cover page of the BULLETIN.

For honorary membership, the Board recommends:

National Catholic Educational Association
Jesuit Educational Association

For regular membership, the board nominates:

Clarkson College of Technology, Potsdam, New York
Marymount College, Salina, Kansas
Polytechnic Institute, San German, Puerto Rico
Rockhurst College, Kansas City, Missouri
Sioux Falls College, Sioux Falls, South Dakota
Transylvania College, Lexington, Kentucky

For nonpayment of the annual fee, the board recommends the dropping of one college from membership.

Approval was given by the board to the report of the temporary committee appointed to discuss the relations of American colleges and universities to emergencies that may arise from the present European war. This temporary committee decided that:

- (1) Problems of war and peace have most vital implications for our colleges and universities;
- (2) Experience of a past war and our involvement therein found our colleges and universities unprepared;
- (3) Our colleges and universities appear to have a special responsibility with regard to the maintenance of peace.

It is recommended that President Ernest H. Wilkins of Oberlin College, President Edward V. Stanford of Villanova College and Executive Director Guy E. Snavely be a committee of three

to represent the Association in further development of a study of these problems. This same committee of three will represent the Association in joint committees that may be formed with other educational groups.

The Association was represented by its executive director at a small group meeting of representatives of the several national university and college associations held last August at the joint call of the U. S. Office of Education and the U. S. Department of State to develop plans for increase of interchange of scholarships and fellowships with the Latin-American countries. Other officers and many presidents of member colleges attended the later meeting held at the Mayflower Hotel in Washington to discuss improvement in cultural relations with the Latin-American countries. It is recommended that the Association endorse the plans of the Division of Cultural Relations in the State Department to improve cultural relations with the Latin-American countries: it is further recommended that the board of directors be authorized to appoint a committee for the furtherance of this object.

REPORT OF THE TREASURER

LEROY E. KIMBALL

COMPTROLLER, NEW YORK UNIVERSITY

SCHEDULE A

STATEMENT OF CASH RECEIPTS AND DISBURSEMENTS GENERAL FUND

January 1, 1939, to December 31, 1939

Balance, January 1, 1939		\$10,079.63
Receipts		
Membership Dues—1936	\$ 50.00	
1937	150.00	
1938	975.00	
1939	25,900.00	
In advance for 1940	200.00	
	<hr/>	\$27,275.00
BULLETIN and Reprints		2,663.24
Books		190.38
Donation		6.66
Interest Received		490.73
	<hr/>	
Total Receipts		30,626.01
		<hr/>
		\$40,705.64

Disbursements

Annual Meeting	\$ 749.54	
American Council on Education	100.00	
Committees and Commissions	2,101.97	
BULLETIN and Reprints	3,144.09	
Deposit with American Air Lines	425.00	
R. L. Kelly		
Secretarial Help	\$ 1,600.00	
Annuity Purchased	1,170.56	
	<hr/>	2,770.56

Office

Rent	\$ 1,899.96	
Expenses	1,031.27	
Equipment	116.79	
Audit	25.00	
Travel	464.57	
Salaries and Annuities	16,173.55	
	<hr/>	19,711.24
Contingencies		41.50
Interest—Transferred to Arts Program		200.00
	<hr/>	

Total Disbursements 29,243.90

Balance—December 31, 1939 \$11,461.74

SCHEDULE B

STATEMENT OF CASH RECEIPTS AND DISBURSEMENTS
SPECIAL PROJECTS

January 1, 1939, to December 31, 1939

Arts Program

Balance, January 1, 1939	\$17,088.07
Receipts	37,868.40
	<hr/>
Disbursements	\$54,956.47
	36,864.59
	<hr/>
Balance, December 31, 1939	\$18,091.88

Library Project

Balance, January 1, 1939	\$ 2,925.63
Disbursements	387.37
	<hr/>
Balance, December 31, 1939	\$ 2,538.26

The American Colleges and the Social Order

Balance, January 1, 1939	\$ 2,753.61
Disbursements	1,303.61
	<hr/>
Balance, December 31, 1939	\$ 1,450.00

Circulating Library of Choral Music

Balance, January 1, 1939	\$ 1,776.55
Receipts	205.49
	<hr/>
Disbursements	\$ 1,982.04
	1,554.28
	<hr/>
Balance, December 31, 1939	\$ 427.76

Grants-in-Aid in Music

Balance, January 1, 1939	\$ 1,100.00
Disbursements	1,100.00
	<hr/>

The Social Security Act in Its Relationship to Colleges

Balance, January 1, 1939	\$ 2,538.46
Disbursements	2,413.51
	<hr/>
Balance, December 31, 1939	\$ 124.95

Everett Dean Martin Appropriation

Received from Carnegie Corporation	\$ 6,750.00
Disbursements	3,303.92
	<hr/>
Balance, December 31, 1939	\$ 3,446.08

SCHEDULE C

STATEMENT OF CASH BALANCES

December 31, 1939

Funds

General Fund	\$11,461.74
Arts Program	18,091.88
Library Project	2,538.26
The American Colleges and the Social Order	1,450.00
Circulating Library of Choral Music	427.76
Grants-in-Aid in Music	
The Social Security Act in its Relationship to Colleges	124.95
Everett Dean Martin Appropriation	3,446.08
Total	\$37,540.67

Composed of Balances in

Guaranty Trust Company	\$15,159.54
Emigrant Savings Bank	7,943.16
Bowery Savings Bank	6,977.60
West Side Savings Bank	7,410.37
Cash on Hand	50.00
Total (as above)	\$37,540.67

SCHEDULE D

BALANCE SHEET

December 31, 1939

Assets

Cash in Banks and on Hand	\$37,540.67
Furniture and Equipment at Estimated Value of	1,733.53
Circulating Library of Choral Music at Estimated Value of	9,239.09
Deposit, American Air Lines	425.00
Total	\$48,938.29

Funds

General Fund	\$13,131.28
Arts Program	18,580.87
Library Project	2,538.26
The American Colleges and the Social Order	1,450.00
Circulating Library of Choral Music	9,666.85
The Social Security Act in its Relationship to Colleges	124.95
Everett Dean Martin Appropriation	3,446.08
Total	\$48,938.29

Tait, Weller & Baker
Accountants and Auditors
Philadelphia—New York

We certify that in our opinion the foregoing statements of Cash Receipts and Disbursements for the year ended December 31, 1939, of the
ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN COLLEGES
properly present the transactions for the year as recorded in the books, and that the balances shown are in agreement with the balances shown by the banks.

TAIT, WELLER & BAKER
(Signed) Emile Z. Baker
Certified Public Accountant

Statement of Income and Expenditures for the Years 1936, 1937, 1938, 1939 as Compared with 1940 Budget

Income		1936	1937	1938	1939	Budget 1940
Membership Dues		\$25,335.90	\$25,065.00	\$26,400.00	\$27,275.00	\$27,000.00
BULLETIN and Reprints		3,054.48	2,539.65	2,366.35	2,663.24	2,000.00
Comprehensive Examinations		241.97	591.85	128.53	119.79	50.00
Music and other Art Books			261.80	123.30	70.59	50.00
Miscellaneous: { Interest		260.51	444.98	603.70	290.73	250.00
{ Other		31.82	108.83	6.50	6.66	
Total Income		\$29,892.24	\$29,012.11	\$29,628.38	\$30,426.01	\$29,350.00
Expenditures						
		1936	1937	1938	1939	Budget 1940
Annual Meeting		\$ 982.71	\$ 1,051.37	\$ 489.70	\$ 749.54	\$ 1,000.00
American Council on Education			100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
Committees and Commissions		1,100.78	374.49	1,044.05	2,101.97	2,000.00
BULLETIN and Reprints		3,870.90	3,634.98	2,942.62	3,144.09	3,000.00
Christian Education Subscriptions		245.00	91.00	224.10		
Comprehensive Examinations			688.65			500.00
Government Relationships			15.25	414.08		1,000.00
Regional Conferences		336.51	862.60	845.60		
Books—Handling		79.56	96.83			
Additional Appropriation for Annuity—Robert L. Kelly						
Secretarial help—Robert L. Kelly					1,170.56	
Headquarters Office:					1,600.00	
Rent		2,000.00	1,933.28	1,899.96	1,899.96	1,900.00
Office Expenses		1,324.88	1,242.36	877.52	1,031.27	1,200.00
Office Equipment			282.10		116.79	200.00
Auditing			40.00	35.00	25.00	50.00
Travel		236.18	115.82	435.56	464.57	600.00
Salaries and Annuities		13,736.62	15,630.98	16,326.17	16,173.65	17,500.00
Contingencies		290.05	52.50	55.93	41.50	200.00
Deposit—American Air Lines					425.00	
Total Disbursements		\$24,303.19	\$26,212.21	\$25,691.29	\$29,043.90	\$29,250.00
Balance on Current Operations		\$ 5,589.05	\$ 2,799.90	\$ 3,937.09	\$ 1,382.11	\$ 100.00
Set aside for purchase of annuity for retiring executive director			\$13,126.00			

REPORT OF THE COMMISSION ON SCHOOL AND COLLEGE RELATIONS OF THE PROGRESSIVE EDUCATION ASSOCIATION

HERBERT E. HAWKES

DEAN, COLUMBIA COLLEGE, COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

SOME seven years ago the Commission of the Progressive Education Association on School and College Relation was organized under a subvention from the General Education Board. One of the most important questions on which the Commission, which is usually referred to as the Eight Year Study, wished to obtain reliable evidence was that of the relation between the pattern of the preparatory school program and college success. Thirty schools of various types were selected for participation in the Study, some of them known as very progressive, others as relatively conservative. Liberal Arts Colleges from every part of the country were almost unanimous in expressing their willingness to admit from these schools during the eight year period of the study students who seemed competent to carry the work of the college successfully, without reference to specific requirements for admission.

Seven of the eight years have passed, and many of the students who entered the Thirty Schools when the Study started, have now completed three years of college work. Students in the following years have completed two and one year respectively, of college residence. There is now available a wealth of information as to the college success of these students who received their preparation in the Thirty Schools. This information has been gathered throughout the seven years by an Evaluation Committee, consisting of several full-time persons on the staff of the Commission who have investigated as carefully and as objectively as they could the preparation, the progress and the comparative success of the students entering the various colleges from the Thirty Schools. Many predictions were ventured at the beginning of the Study, but only recently do we have a real ground for conviction.

At a recent meeting of the Commission, a Committee was appointed to examine the evidence concerning the college success of

the graduates of the Thirty Schools. The remarks that I am about to make have the approval of this Committee, which consists of President Barrows of Lawrence College, Dean Brumbaugh of the University of Chicago, Doctor Gummere of Harvard University, President Park of Bryn Mawr, Dean Speight of Swarthmore and me. Doctor Gummere wishes to add the footnote that Harvard, as I dare say many other colleges, still regards entrance examinations as a partial but indispensable test for admission, except in very special cases. For several years Harvard has pursued the policy of admitting, with a minimum of written examination, boys from the Highest Seventh of their graduating classes from many schools not among the Thirty. Doctor Gummere tells me that these students in the Highest Seventh, from schools not among the Thirty, are as successful in college as those admitted from the Thirty Schools.

It should be stated that many of the Thirty Schools modified their curriculums radically after entering the Study. Others have made only slight changes. So far as I know, none of the colleges which these students have entered have modified their curriculums or the requirements for their degrees for these students as a group. That is, we have light on the question as to whether the character of the teaching and general experience in these schools, which most of us classify as progressive, fits or misfits students for college work.

About 3300 students from the Thirty Schools entered college in September 1936, '37 and '38. Of these students, 1472 were enrolled in about thirty colleges in sufficiently large groups to justify a detailed following of their college residence. It should be mentioned that the Thirty Schools' graduates score distinctly higher on aptitude or intelligence tests than the average entering student. So far as one can judge, their mean is in about the 65th percentile. It was therefore necessary, in order to get a fair estimate of the college success of these students, to set up a control or comparison group in each college. So each Thirty Schools student is matched in terms of age, sex, race, aptitude, interests, size and type of home community and family background, as exactly as is humanly possible with another student similar in all of these respects, but from a school not among the Thirty. It goes without saying that such a comparison group

does not furnish a perfect statistical control, but it is probably as nearly accurate as the usual measurement of college success in terms of instructors' grades.

In order to obtain a comparison between the Thirty Schools' graduates and their mates in the control group, members of the Evaluation Committee of the Eight Year Study have regularly visited the institutions where any considerable number of the students were registered in order to become personally acquainted with them and with their controls just referred to, so that they might reach as well-considered opinions as possible regarding their adjustment to the work of the college, and the measure of success that they attained, both in their studies and in their social relations. Comparisons in each of the major fields of study between the Thirty Schools' graduates and their control mates have been made with scrupulous care. I will not go into the statistical results at this time. Sufficient to say that observation of the 1472 students from the Thirty Schools, which were about evenly divided between the sexes, indicates very little difference in college grades between them and their controls. On the whole, the students from the Thirty Schools were slightly superior to the control group. Those who have been in college for three years excelled slightly in the Humanities, the Social Sciences, and the Physical Sciences. The grades were almost exactly even in English and the Biological Sciences. They were distinctly inferior in the Foreign Languages, but distinctly superior in such subjects as Fine Arts, Music and the like. I will not attempt to analyze the results for those who have had only two or one year of college experience, except to say that the students from the Thirty Schools who entered in 1938, and whose college records for only one year are available, excel their controls from other schools in every field of study, notably in English, Humanities, Physical Sciences and Mathematics. This may reflect the careful job that the faculties of the Thirty Schools have done during the past three years in improving their curriculums, and affording a more adequate intellectual training for their students.

One further observation is interesting. A report on the college success of the graduates of the six of the Thirty Schools whose programs differ most from the conventional pattern, that

is, what one would call the most progressive schools, is compared with that of their comparison groups. A complementary report has been made on the college success of the graduates of the six of the Thirty Schools which differ least from the conventional pattern as compared with their matched pairs. There were 361 students from the six most progressive schools, and 417 from the most conventional schools. It turns out that the students from the most progressive schools excelled their controls by a score that may roughly be expressed as 27 to 7, while the students from the most conventional schools of the Thirty Schools were excelled by their control group by a score that may roughly be expressed as 14 to 16. That is, as far as these data are significant, the students from the schools whose pattern of program differed most from the conventional were very distinctly superior to those from the more conventional type of school. It cannot be inferred that the methods of the more progressive schools account entirely for the superiority of the group that they send to college. There may be a selection at a lower level. It is possible that particularly thoughtful and adventurous parents choose these schools for their children, and that in the homes from which the pupils of these schools come there are stimulating influences toward wide reading, frank discussion and a broad outlook.

I should add that in extra-curricular interests non-athletic in character, the graduates of the Thirty Schools are markedly more alert than their comparison group.

The results of this study seem to indicate that the pattern of preparatory school program which concentrates on a preparation for a fixed set of entrance examinations is not the only satisfactory means of fitting a boy or girl for making the most out of the college experience. It looks as if the capacities and interests of the students are fully as important as the pattern of subject matter studied, and apparently the stimulus and initiative which the less conventional approach to secondary school education affords sends on to college students as well, if not better, prepared for the college experience than comparable students who have had the more traditional preparation.

REPORT OF THE COMMISSION ON ACADEMIC FREEDOM AND ACADEMIC TENURE

HENRY M. WRISTON

PRESIDENT, BROWN UNIVERSITY

STATEMENT OF CHAIRMAN HENRY M. WRISTON

AT the last annual meeting in Louisville, the Commission on Academic Freedom and Tenure submitted a document drafted jointly by your Commission and a Committee representing the American Association of University Professors. This was designed as a substitute for a statement of like character presented in 1925 and adopted by that Association, by this body and by several other educational organizations.

This Association after preliminary moves, including an amendment of the statement, returned the document for resubmission in 1940 without prejudice.

During the year four things of first-class importance have happened. First, one of the members of this Association, after an earnest attempt at mediation had been undertaken by your Commission, was put on the list of censured administrations by the American Association of University Professors because of a case growing out of the activities of a full professor, long a member of the professional faculty, on the grounds of his public political activity. Such an occurrence shows that the lack of clarity on this issue leads to difficulties, sometimes of a very serious nature.

The second important consideration is by no means as tangible and yet is, on the whole, more significant. It has become increasingly clear as the year has gone on that the existence of the new statement, drafted as it was, even though it was not adopted by this body, has destroyed the moral position of the Statement of 1925. Although that statement was adopted by a number of associations, its basic moral position rested upon its adoption by the American Association of University Professors and by this body because those were the two Associations which treated it as an operative document and not merely as a pious expression. The fact that these two Associations, to a greater or lesser degree, have moved toward a substitute accounts for this loss of moral

position. While, therefore, the Statement of 1925 still rests upon the books of this organization and certain other organizations, it is not that statement but the new statement which has the moral ascendancy.

The third important occurrence during the year is the incidence of war and its attendant problems for neutral United States. When war was declared there was very serious doubt in many quarters whether we could maintain neutrality, and while people feel more hopeful on that point now, it is not yet a settled issue. If the present war turns into a totalitarian war, if it spreads to Scandinavia whose meticulous neutrality was supposed to be virtually impregnable, and if other possibilities materialize, issues may be drawn in the United States with an acid sharpness that we cannot now accurately describe. It seemed, therefore, to your Board of Directors and to the members of the Commission essential that there should be on our records a clear and modern statement.

The fourth consideration, even before that in importance, is another of the intangibles, but no less real for that fact. While the discussion of this statement was not, unfortunately, as widespread as we had desired because of the absence of regional conferences and certain other factors, there was, nonetheless, exchange of opinion regarding it, and it became adequately clear that this body was not likely to adopt the current statement without amendment. When this became evident, an attempt was made to arrange another joint conference between the members of your Commission and the Committee of the American Association of University Professors. However, this proved impossible in the time allowed. Consequently it was suggested at the joint meeting of the Commission and your Board of Directors that this Association take independent action upon as much of the statement as was acceptable to its members, and a letter from the General Secretary of the American Association of University Professors contains this passage: "I think your Commission on Academic Freedom and Tenure should report to your forthcoming Annual Meeting on January 11 the amendments to the present statement it desires, and seek to secure endorsement of all the other provisions of the statement." With that opinion the Chairman of Committee A of the American Association of Uni-

versity Professors is in agreement, as is also the Council of that organization. The substance of the suggestion was transmitted to the members of your Commission, and without dissent they agreed to it.

I come to you, therefore, with the statement as amended at a joint meeting of the Board of Directors of the Association of American Colleges and your Commission on Academic Freedom. All the changes were made by unanimous vote and at the close it was voted unanimously that all members of both bodies present would support the statement as redrafted.

You have before you the redrafted statement. I will not weary you with a repetition of the arguments presented last year, but will confine myself exclusively to the changes; and I will say that every point which was subjected to criticism last year has been changed. There are three. In the third paragraph the last sentence formerly read, "Upon freedom and economic security, and hence upon tenure, depends the success of an institution in fulfilling its obligations to its students and to society." It now reads, "Freedom and economic security, hence tenure, are indispensable to the success of an institution in fulfilling its obligations to its students and to society." The revision is entirely noncontentious. The object is simply to make the meaning clearer. No one would dispute, for example, that equipment, resources, skill in teaching, and many other things are also necessary for the success of an institution. The new statement is cast in an inclusive form whereas the old one was in exclusive terms.

The second change involves striking out the sentence which an amendment from the floor last year proposed to strike out. This was the last sentence in paragraph (c) under Academic Freedom and read, "The judgment of what constitutes fulfillment of these obligations (that is, his obligations as a citizen) should rest with the individual." It was eliminated by your Commission because it was felt that the sentence as it stood was open to the possible interpretation that the institution should protect the man from criticism. Frankly, it did not occur to me that anyone who spoke as a citizen could escape censure. His freedom to speak involves a correlative freedom on the part of others to criticize and oppose what he says, even to the point of *argumentum ad*

hominem, and that criticism or censure may come from individuals or groups or organizations. However, it was the opinion of the overwhelming majority of your Board of Directors and the Commission on Academic Freedom and Tenure, as well as of those who were consulted, that the sentence was open to that interpretation.

The elision of the last sentence does not alter the sentence above wherein the teacher is given freedom from institutional censorship or discipline. The principal object of the paragraph is to protect him in his relationship with those who exercise authority within the field of his activity. The last sentence, it was felt, went far beyond that and appeared to withdraw the right from anyone under any circumstances whatever to say that the teacher, no matter how wild or unjustified his remarks, had violated the canons of ethics which are there laid down. For that reason it was stricken out.

Although the principal object of the paragraph, as I have indicated, is to protect the individual in his relationship with authority, it has a second importance scarcely less great; namely, to protect the institution itself from a responsibility which it is not capable of discharging and which it is not desirable that it should attempt to discharge. Recently, two members of the Faculty came to me to ask if I had any objection if they took ordination into holy orders, and I was a little chagrined that anybody could dream that the institution should in any way stand between a man and his God; nor should the institution stand between a man and the State. In those relationships he should be an individual. In almost every instance where there has been interference on either of these points, it has been unfortunate. It is, therefore, a protection to the institution to have it clearly understood that those are two responsibilities which it does not accept.

The third change has to do with the detailed provision with regard to the acquisition of tenure after a stated and minutely defined period of probation. That section was open to the criticism that it violated the foundation upon which this whole statement was drafted; namely, the separation of principles and procedures into different categories with different moral position and sanction, principles having a higher moral position and sanction than procedures.

In the statement presented last year, paragraph (2) under Academic Tenure read: "Beginning with appointment to the rank of full-time instructor or a higher rank, the probationary period should not exceed six years, including within this period full-time service in all institutions of higher education; but subject to the proviso that when, after a term of probationary service of more than three years in one or more institutions, a teacher is called to another institution it may be agreed in writing that his new appointment is for a probationary period of not more than three years, even though thereby the person's total probationary period in the academic profession is extended beyond the normal maximum of six years. Notice should be given at least one year prior to the expiration of the probationary period, if the teacher is not to be continued in service after the expiration of that period." It has been amended to read: "Each institution should define with great care the probationary period and notify every appointee of its precise length and its terms. Notice should be given at least one year prior to the expiration of the probationary period if the teacher is not to be continued in service after the expiration of that period."

In making the change there is no desire whatever to bring into question the principle of probation with tenure thereafter. There is, on the other hand, the unanimous agreement that it is impractical to set an arbitrary period of six years (particularly with the proviso which was formerly included) and making it applicable to all institutions, large or small, collegiate in form or university in structure. It is the hope of your Commission that, at subsequent meetings with the Committee of the American Association of University Professors, this section may be re-drafted in such terms that ultimately both Associations can endorse a uniform statement. The draft now before you for endorsement constitutes a statement, therefore, which may not be final but which represents, pending further conferences, the judgment, both of your Commission and of your Board of Directors.

I make no effort to conceal the fact that it is not as satisfactory to have two statements as to have one. However, the two statements do not have insuperable differences and it is hoped that in subsequent negotiations uniformity can be secured. Even

with these differences, the endorsement of the statement as amended by this body will provide a working arrangement through the period of tension in which we already find ourselves.

On behalf of the Commission I move that this Association endorse the amended statement.

STATEMENT OF WILLIAM C. DENNIS

I arise to second President Wriston's motion for the endorsement of the statement on Academic Freedom and Tenure as amended by the Commission on Academic Freedom and Tenure of this Association. In seconding this motion, however, I wish to file what a lawyer might call a brief separate but conferring opinion which reaches the same conclusion reached by President Wriston but as to one point adopts a somewhat different course of reasoning.

My remarks are directed entirely to paragraph C of the statement under the heading Academic Freedom. I believe that this paragraph as amended is not entirely clear on its face and requires some interpretation in the light of its history. The whole burden of the fight made on this paragraph in its original form at the Louisville meeting was that it imposed certain serious obligations on the teacher when he speaks or writes as a citizen and then provided in its last sentence that "the judgment of what constitutes fulfilment of these obligations should rest with the individual," thus making the teacher the judge in his own case as respects the propriety of his conduct as a citizen. It was proposed that this should be corrected by striking out the offending sentence and substituting a fair and impartial tribunal to determine the issues involved. This association did strike out the last sentence and then put the whole matter over until this year. The amended statement now before us also strikes out the last sentence but makes no express provision for a fair and impartial tribunal. I submit, however, that in view of the tenor and purpose of the entire paragraph and in the light of the debate which took place last year, the striking out of the last sentence not only permits general censure by outside bodies but by fair and necessary implication leaves the way open for the setting up of such a tribunal so long as the arrangement made does not conflict with the earlier provision prohibiting "institutional censorship and discipline."

To be more specific, by way of illustration, I do not believe that the adoption of this statement as amended precludes the setting up in various ways of various types of impartial non-institutional tribunals or committees to which grievances could be submitted by educational institutions. For example such a tribunal or committee might be constituted as suggested by Dr. Allee in the *Bulletin* of the Association of American University Professors for October 1939, from representatives of the Association of American Colleges, the Association of American Universities and the Association of American University Professors. Or, in my opinion, such a committee might include members elected by the faculty of the institution in question or members chosen from its alumni or constituency, always provided that the committee was fairly constituted and was *bona fide* non-institutional in character. Further, I do not believe that the statement as amended precludes the initiative of the institution in bringing such a tribunal into being nor does it preclude action by an institution as a result of the judgment of such a non-institutional tribunal or committee.

I do not desire to argue this interpretation at this time. I simply want to put it into the record for all pertinent purposes. Some of the most important provisions of the United States Constitution, including for example the expression "direct tax," were adopted and consciously adopted with knowledge that they were susceptible of more than one meaning and with no attempt at definition or interpretation. So let it be with paragraph C of the amended statement on Academic Freedom and Tenure.

I second President Wriston's motion for the endorsement of the statement as amended.

In response to President Dennis' statement, Mr. Wriston said, "I dissent entirely from that interpretation. In my judgment the statement in Paragraph (c) that 'When he speaks or writes as a citizen, he should be free from institutional censorship or discipline' means precisely that and nothing else."

REVISED AND APPROVED STATEMENT

The purpose of this statement is to promote public understanding and support of academic freedom and tenure and agreement upon procedures to assure them in colleges and universities. Institutions of higher education are conducted for the common

good and not to further the interest of either the individual teacher* or the institution as a whole. The common good depends upon the free search for truth and its free exposition.

Academic freedom is essential to these purposes and applies to both teaching and research. Freedom in research is fundamental to the advancement of truth. Academic freedom in its teaching aspect is fundamental for the protection of the rights of the teacher in teaching and of the student to freedom in learning. It carries with it duties correlative with rights.

Tenure is a means to certain ends; specifically: (1) Freedom of teaching and research and of extra-mural activities, and (2) a sufficient degree of economic security to make the profession attractive to men and women of ability. Freedom and economic security, hence tenure, are indispensable to the success of an institution in fulfilling its obligations to its students and to society.

ACADEMIC FREEDOM

(a) The teacher is entitled to full freedom in research and in the publication of the results, subject to the adequate performance of his other academic duties; but research for pecuniary return should be based upon an understanding with the authorities of the institution.

(b) The teacher is entitled to freedom in the classroom in discussing his subject, but he should be careful not to introduce into his teaching controversial matter which has no relation to his subject. Limitations of academic freedom because of religious or other aims of the institution should be clearly stated in writing at the time of the appointment.

(c) The college or university teacher is a citizen, a member of a learned profession and an officer of an educational institution. When he speaks or writes as a citizen, he should be free from institutional censorship or discipline, but his special position in the community imposes special obligations. As a man of learning and an educational officer, he should remember that the public may judge his profession and his institution by his utterances. Hence he should at all times be accurate, should exercise appropriate restraint, should show respect for the opinions of others

* The word "teacher" as used in this document is understood to include the investigator who is attached to an academic institution without teaching duties.

and should make every effort to indicate that he is not an institutional spokesman.

ACADEMIC TENURE

(a) After the expiration of a probationary period teachers or investigators should have permanent or continuous tenure, and their services should be terminated only for adequate cause, except in the case of retirement for age, or under extraordinary circumstances because of financial exigencies.

In the interpretation of this principle it is understood that the following represents acceptable academic practice:

(1) The precise terms and conditions of every appointment should be stated in writing and be in the possession of both institution and teacher before the appointment is consummated.

(2) Each institution should define with great care the probationary period and notify every appointee of its precise length and its terms. Notice should be given at least one year prior to the expiration of the probationary period if the teacher is not to be continued in service after the expiration of that period.

(3) During the probationary period a teacher should have the academic freedom that all other members of the faculty have.

(4) Termination for cause of a continuous appointment, or the dismissal for cause of a teacher previous to the expiration of a term appointment, should, if possible, be considered by both a faculty committee and the governing board of the institution. In all cases where the facts are in dispute, the accused teacher should be informed before the hearing in writing of the charges against him and should have the opportunity to be heard in his own defense by all bodies that pass judgment upon his case. He should be permitted to have with him an adviser of his own choosing who may act as counsel. There should be a full stenographic record of the hearing available to the parties concerned. In the hearing of charges of incompetence the testimony should include that of teachers and other scholars, either from his own or from other institutions. Teachers on continuous appointment who are dismissed for reasons not involving moral turpitude should receive their salaries for at least a year from the date of notification of dismissal whether or not they are continued in their duties at the institution.

(5) Termination of a continuous appointment because of financial exigency should be demonstrably *bona fide*.

REPORT OF THE COMMISSION ON THE ARTS

R. H. FITZGERALD

PROVOST, UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH

DURING the past twelve months the Commission on the Arts has held three meetings, each devoted to the work of the Association's Concert Project or, as it has more recently been named, the Arts Program. At the meeting on March 3, 1939, the Commission reviewed the experience gained by the Concert Project during three seasons in encouraging music as an ingredient in liberal culture through the circulation, first, of distinguished concert artists and later of faculty musicians on leave from their institutions for such visits. The members of the Commission were agreed that these two-day and half-week visits in which the formal concert would be supplemented by informal programs and by personal contact between the artist and the musical interests on the campus were stimulating to music departments and to those enrolled therein and were even more so to faculty and students generally in developing music as a part of their daily lives.

The three-year grant from the Carnegie Corporation for the development of a similar Program in the Arts (as announced last spring) made possible a series of visits by Faculty Artists and Peripatetic Professors, in music, in the graphic and plastic arts, in drama and in other subjects of liberal education.

The schedule of visits arranged by the Arts Program for the current season with 151 member institutions in the Association was reviewed in detail by the Commission at its second meeting held on October 30. This schedule includes artists in residence and visits by concert musicians, professors from member colleges and by others attached to related institutions, such as the Library of Congress and art museums. It was agreed that the Arts Program should preserve its experimental character and attempt to gain during this and the coming academic year all experience possible through arranging visits of varying length by people whose special interest might be vital to liberal arts education generally.

On this occasion also the Commission reviewed the progress

of the Circulating Library of Choral Music established under a special preliminary grant from the Carnegie Corporation and amplified by the donations from Mr. Henry S. Drinker of Philadelphia. The number of colleges availing themselves of this library was—at that date—46.

At its meeting held on January 10, 1940, the Commission discussed the outcome of the visits fulfilled thus far this season and the supplementary list of visits arranged in the subjects of foreign policy, and creative writing.

In presenting this report the Commission is convinced from the evidence in hand from the institutions that have had these visits; (1) that liberal arts education as given by the full time resident faculties has been strengthened, (2) that the cultural horizon of institutions has been, in some instances, extended.

REPORT OF THE COMMISSION ON PUBLIC RELATIONS

FRANCIS P. GAINES

PRESIDENT, WASHINGTON AND LEE UNIVERSITY

DURING the past year, the Commission on Public Relations has given attention to three matters of importance to our member institutions.

First of these in time and first in the volume of that attention was the relation of the privately controlled college to the Federal program of Social Security legislation.

At its Louisville meeting in January, 1939, this Association received a report, made in good faith, to the effect that our institutions might be included under the old-age pension feature of this legislation without having to accept the other provisions of the program as a whole. Acting on this report, the Association voted by a small majority to endorse such old-age coverage for the privately controlled colleges and universities.

After the Association had adjourned, however, the recommendation of the Social Security Board to Congress proposed that these colleges should be included not only under the old-age pension feature but also under the unemployment compensation feature.

Your Commission sent a telegram to the president of every member institution asking his attitude. The replies, numbering about 500, were virtually unanimous in opposition to the unemployment compensation feature. Seeking exact facts to present to Congress, the Commission then prepared a little questionnaire which would indicate the effect of this tax on college budgets and any possible benefit that the college might derive from it. About 125 institutions replied, and the comment without exception showed that such an unemployment compensation tax would be crippling and that practically no benefit could be derived from this particular feature.

The Commission thus found its attitude of opposition to the unemployment compensation abundantly confirmed. It faced then two questions, both sharply emphasized in many of the replies received from presidents of our member colleges.

The first question was whether the old-age plan could be en-

tirely separated from the other features of social security; the report of the Social Security Board had certainly not been in accord with the impression prevailing at our Louisville meeting. The second question was whether, in view of this position taken by the Board, the old-age pension plan, even if made a feature for separable consideration, could be reported not as a Federal tax but as a kind of contribution made by the colleges to a nationalized benefit fund, all contributions in theory at least to be returned to beneficiaries designated by the colleges.

To these questions the Commission had no dependable answer; and it did not know when such an answer worthy of our full reliance might be found. The Commission, therefore, resolved to oppose any involvement of the privately controlled colleges with the Federal Social Security, certainly until such time as the Association itself, preferably with the issues clarified, might determine this desirable course of action. A brief, phrasing our opposition, was prepared and sent to the presidents of member institutions and certain indirect or unofficial contacts were established by various individual members of the Commission.

Those changes proposed by the Social Security Board which affected our institutions were not adopted by the Congress of 1939.

II

The second phase of our work dealt with the proposed plan of general Federal aid to education throughout the states of the Union. This plan was given legislative form in two bills, with slight variations.

The Commission recognized that the sentiment of educational leadership is divided on the question of whether direct aid to local education is a legitimate function of the Federal government; and on this issue as such the Commission took no position.

It did, however, recognize the vagueness of phrasing in the specific bills and the quite unpredictable effect which they might have upon higher education. Thus the bill allowed Federal aid for the establishment of junior colleges but gave no hint as to the nature of the colleges proposed. The bill further provided, with looseness of phrase which would certainly invite variable interpretation, for Federal assistance in teacher training courses, the assistance to go to regular teachers' colleges, to divisions of

universities for such training and even to departments of colleges for this week. The bill authorized, in yet undefined modes, the concentrating of important authority as to standards and personnel in the hands of the United States Department of Education, and thus it provided at least an opportunity for a long step toward the centralizing of all education control.

Believing that the impact of this measure upon higher education as now administered should be made the subject of further study the Commission, after several meetings for full discussion, registered opposition to these plans.

III

The third activity of your Commission was in the field of Federal taxation as it affects the privately controlled institutions of higher learning.

On the invitation of the Undersecretary of the Treasury, the Commission held in December a joint meeting with the Treasury's Board of Tax Research to discuss the proposal for a reduction of the 15 per cent exemption in income reports now allowed for charitable gifts. The Commission presented such evidence, or at least testimony, as it could command in support of its position that the exemption should not be reduced.

The Commission has been mindful of another problem in taxation, the tax upon estates which include charitable bequests. The law itself involves highly technical considerations which are just now being scrutinized by some of the best legal talent on the faculties of certain member institutions. The Commission did, however, request as liberal interpretation of existing laws as may be possible, believing that the benefits accruing to our institutions would be clearly defensible in terms of the social validity of the ends thus protracted.

IV

By way of recommendation, the Commission would give emphasis to the obvious fact that if our colleges do not wish to be included under Federal Social Security, they should set up as quickly as possible adequate plans of their own to guarantee such benefits alike to professional and non-professional staffs. Our situation at the moment is not creditable to us. The Commission

estimates that about half of the teachers in the institutions of this Association have old-age coverage; but since the larger schools in general are the ones that have adopted such plans, this statement does not imply that half of the institutions, or anything like half, have sufficient protection even for faculty members. Few of the institutions, moreover, have done anything for non-professional workers. As agencies of social idealism, we ourselves must not be guilty of neglecting a practical social obligation now universally recognized.

REPORT OF THE COMMISSION ON TEACHER EDUCATION

HARRY M. GAGE

PRESIDENT, COE COLLEGE

THIS is the third annual report of your Commission to the Association. It may be more a report on the passing of time than a statement of progress.

A pertinent comment on our two previous reports may be that we should not await more surveys or more reports. What is really needed is more cerebration, more imagination, more courageous action, more cooperation within colleges and between the numerous agencies which are working on the problem of teacher education. We are told that in the field of secondary education alone foundations have expended about fifteen million dollars on studies in teacher education. A present need is to make recent reports and the results of current studies available and useful. Executives feel that different lines of inquiry should be brought to focus by some national organization. Some steps should be taken to promote a high degree of cooperation in this field of endeavor. Probably the Teacher Education Commission of the American Council on Education is the body to which to look for leadership in this direction. For use of new procedures we should look to regional accrediting agencies.

In the midst of a wide diversity of opinion there seems to be a general conviction that the fundamental thing that all teachers need is a true liberal education.

Those who approach the problem of the supply, preparation and certification of teachers sooner or later and in one way or another ask two questions. First, What is teacher education? Second, What is teacher training? Asking these questions generally leads to the conclusion with which we agree that teacher education which is broad and academically sound is preliminary to training in teacher techniques. Successful teaching is not marked by narrow uniformity in preliminary professional training and shows still less uniformity in the practice of the art.

In the education of a teacher there must be provision for broad general knowledge which offers reasonable guarantee that the

prospective teacher, through extensive study in such areas as language, fine and practical arts, mathematics, physical and biological sciences, social sciences, health and public welfare, shall acquire an understanding of the major problems of social life and their implications for learners, parents and general public.

There is general agreement, too, that the prospective teachers should have an understanding of the purposes and functions of education in our democracy. They should also have the ability to guide learners at different learning levels in the selection of worthwhile activities and experiences and to aid learners in using abilities, aptitudes and experiences for the achievement of life purposes.

The selection of prospective teachers who can thus lead and direct their pupils is more important than their training. Colleges frequently fail in this sphere. Selection should not be left to failure in classroom experience or to the employer.

The preparation of teachers is the business of the whole institution and not of a single department. The long-standing sense of difference and frequent misunderstanding between members of the staff in education and the liberal arts group is a detriment to teacher education. Teacher education and training is the business of the entire instructional staff of a college preparing teachers for service in the public schools.

Professional problems should, of course, be studied; so, too, should human problems. Subject matter, nevertheless, is of first importance. Individual departments may well be organized to give short courses on methods of teaching that department's subject matter, giving especial attention to translating that subject matter into terms appropriate to a different learning level.

The demands for purely professional education and technical training of teachers as a part of a liberal arts course are well met by adding a fifth year beyond the regular four-year college course. The objection to this suggestion is that the fifth year may be added without adequate provision for it.

It should always be remembered that good teaching in any subject matter is an effective revelation of what good teaching is. A college can do most for teacher education by providing examples of good teaching in all departments. The subject matter is that with which the prospective teacher will deal in future

years. In this respect the part of a college in educating teachers differs from the part it plays in educating students for the practice of most other professions. However, it will always be important for teachers to adapt material received at the college learning level to the learning level of secondary or grade school.

In all that has been stated we may have overlooked the most fertile field in which to labor with hope of immediately successful results. That field is certification of teachers. As long as there is wide divergence in practice among states in certification of teachers, it will be difficult to make teaching a real profession. Education and training requirements vary enormously. Some states issue teachers' certificates on graduation from the eighth grade; others require at least graduation from high school; still others require four years in college. It would probably be a highly profitable venture to engage actively in a program designed to set up minimum requirements for entrance into the practice of teaching. In some states requirements for certificates are controlled directly by the legislature. In most states the requirements are set by a certifying board which could cooperate in a long time program looking toward the establishment of teaching as a profession. A nation-wide venture into this field might be fruitless. Problems are to a large extent regional, and we do have at our disposal regional conferences in which effective work in the field of certification might be instituted. We should move in the direction of more and better education and more flexible requirements for certificates.

The education of college teachers is a field in which members of this Association are vitally interested and in which their desires should be effective. Extreme specialization and accentuated departmentalization in college do not promote proper education of a high school teacher who needs a general education and advanced work in a subject matter field. In like manner liberal arts colleges need teachers who are liberally educated at the graduate level. From graduate schools they receive highly specialized teachers with the departmental mind which is the curse of many colleges. The educational program of graduate schools is ineffective for the purposes of colleges which employ a large percentage of those receiving advanced university degrees.

Are colleges or graduate schools at fault? Where should the

remedy be applied? Our first impulse is to turn to the graduate schools. Attention to them will not be misdirected. Our energy may be wasted occasionally or generally. In a few graduate schools it will be a welcome influence.

Those who have made a preliminary exploration of the graduate school of education of college teachers report that university presidents and deans are quite favorable to investigation and consideration of possible change in procedure. However, these executives do not feel that they have much influence with the professorial brethren. In some way the graduate school professor must be reached. Entrenched behind departmental barriers, he is almost inaccessible. The graduate school in which he teaches is probably too rigidly departmentalized, and in many instances departmental programs are defective even for the purpose of producing a specialist. In any event the typical graduate school professor is inclined to be interested, primarily, in students aiming at and capable of entering upon research careers. Nevertheless, we repeat, the individual professor must be reached. Possibly the individual and collective efforts of several hundred colleges will serve to implement the good will of university executives.

Colleges themselves should array themselves in the beautiful robes of humility. They, too, are at fault. Responsibility for improvement does not fall entirely on graduate schools. A flaw, and some say the one underlying flaw, in the present situation is the insistence of liberal arts colleges that their teachers possess the Ph.D. degree. Therefore, if colleges will free themselves from this fetish worship—so runs the argument—graduate schools will be eager to supply the type of education needed to prepare students for effective teaching careers on the collegiate level.

The Ph.D. degree has come to signify capacity for independent investigation. There is reason to believe that it should remain so. Attempts have been made to create doctors' degrees to signify some other type of training. Such degrees are quite meaningless. An attempt to establish them in American educational practice will confuse the issue and not solve the problem. If the Ph.D. degree remains what it is, the training appropriate to it will emphasize research experience in successively narrower segments of the field of study. The result will be a type of training which will be of undoubted value to the university scholar but which

may actually damage the effectiveness of a teacher in a college of liberal arts. Research and teaching ability are not mutually exclusive; neither are they necessarily combined in the same person.

This Association should look with favor on graduate schools which provide a broad and flexible experience for the education of teachers and which are active in selecting prospective college teachers. In these schools divisional organizations, which are inter-departmental, are in charge of this general education. One who intends to teach English is encouraged to study in such fields as history, philosophy and fine arts. He will study in the department of education with his profession in view, but will not be required to enter upon such a specialization in the field of English as will narrow his view as he progresses in his training for independent investigation. For teachers so educated there should be a demand from colleges. They need teachers whose graduate education is broad and whose knowledge of their specialized subject matter is correlated with knowledge of cognate fields. Teachers so educated would improve college teaching generally and would improve the education of high school teachers in college.

Colleges very properly will not give up entirely their demand for Ph.D.'s. Their tolerance for Ph.D.'s. is considerable. Probably they need a few. Why do they demand so many? Because the regional accrediting agencies count Ph.D.'s and give a favorable rating to a college having a relatively large number on its instructional staff. If this is not a desirable procedure, the colleges can free themselves from it by action of their associations in various regions. To do so abruptly would not be desirable. The process of developing a new type of well-educated college teacher should be gradual and should follow the development of liberal graduate courses for college teachers by universities. This development our Association should encourage.

For some time the accrediting agencies have given consideration to the "Ph.D. degree or its equivalent." This doctrine of equivalence has been very difficult to apply. The development of the new type of graduate education for college teachers to which we have referred would solve a difficult problem which has perplexed regional accrediting agencies for many years.

RECOMMENDATIONS

It is recommended that

1. We approve a joint effort of colleges and graduate schools to improve college teaching.
2. That liberal arts colleges which provide more than fifty per cent of the supply of teachers for our public schools shall very seriously consider the exercise of this great responsibility for our national welfare.
3. That regional conferences give attention to requirements for certification of teachers.
4. That the Board of Directors in preparing the program for our next annual meeting shall seriously consider the placing of major emphasis on teacher education.

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON INSURANCE AND ANNUITIES

WILLIAM E. WELD
PRESIDENT, WELLS COLLEGE

THE Committee on Insurance and Annuities has attempted first to keep in touch with the developments at Washington which bear on the relation of the colleges to social security; second to be informed as to the attitudes and actions of the non-profit organizations with reference to the Social Security Act; and third to suggest a policy of further action regarding retiring annuities both for professional and non-professional staffs of the colleges.

The report undertakes:

I. To outline the events since the Louisville meeting of the Association which have a bearing upon the possible inclusion of the colleges under the old-age and survivors provisions of the Social Security Act.

II. To describe briefly the amendments significant to the colleges in the Social Security Act which have been adopted in 1939.

III. To present recommendations of the Committee.

THE EVENTS OF 1939

1. A few days after the Louisville meeting a report of the Social Security Board was made public, in which that board recommended the inclusion of non-profit institutions under the provisions of the Social Security Act relating to unemployment insurance as well as to old-age benefits.

2. The Commission on Public Relations of the Association of American Colleges hastily collected evidence from the member colleges which disclosed that they were unanimously opposed to the inclusion of the colleges in the operation of the Act as far as unemployment insurance was concerned.

3. The Commission prepared a brief for the Ways and Means Committee stating this position. This brief was not presented because the Ways and Means Committee announced its decision to make no recommendations to modify existing exemptions.

4. On May 19, 1939, Miss Glass, Messrs. Snively, Lowes and Weld represented the colleges at a conference called in New York

by Douglas Brown, who had been chairman of the Advisory Council on Social Security during its deliberations the year before. This conference permitted a free discussion by the representatives of practically all the non-profit organizations as to their attitude regarding the Social Security Act. By pre-arrangement, no definite conclusions were reached.

5. The board of directors of the Association of American Colleges suggested to the Committee on Insurance and Annuities that every effort be made to urge the member colleges, which had not done so already, to establish retirement plans for both professional and non-professional staffs. With this in mind, a foundation was asked for a grant to enable a competent person to visit the colleges. Because of the political aspects of the problem, the foundation did not wish to become involved and so refused the request for a grant.

6. On December 13, a meeting of the Committee on Insurance and Annuities was held in Doctor Snively's office in New York. The Committee decided to make certain recommendations which will be presented at the end of this report.

7. On December 21, an informal committee representing non-profit institutions called on the Honorable Paul McNutt, Federal Security Administrator, to discuss with him the position of the non-profit institutions. With one exception these representatives had a common attitude toward inclusion under the Social Security Act, namely: to favor inclusion under the old-age and survivors benefit provisions if general tax exemptions would not be thus imperiled, and if this would not carry with it inclusion under the provisions for unemployment insurance. The Association of Social Workers desired inclusion under both of these provisions. The various national organizations represented were: community chests, hospitals, Jewish welfare societies, social workers, colleges, Episcopal Church and the Catholic Church. The result of this conference was largely negative. Mr. McNutt was not ready to modify the recommendation which was made by the Social Security Board in January, 1939. He suggested that the non-profit institutions which wished to be included in old-age coverage make as strong a representation as possible before the Ways and Means Committee of the House.

8. On December 21, Mr. Robbins and I called on Mr. Alt-

meyer and Mr. Bigge, both members of the Social Security Board. Mr. Altmeyer restated the Social Security Board's recommendation that the non-profit organizations be included under the Act for both old-age and unemployment coverage and expressed his view that nothing had occurred to change that recommendation. He did not expect the Board to make a recommendation this year unless requested to do so.

Chairman Altmeyer was disturbed by a charge that he had promised the Committee on Insurance and Annuities late in 1938 that the Social Security Board would not recommend unemployment insurance for the non-profit organizations. It is my personal opinion that Mr. Altmeyer did not make a promise. Our criticism is that he gave us no indication that a recommendation for inclusion under the provisions for the unemployment insurance would be made. He justified his silence on the grounds: (1) That at the time of his conference with the members of the Committee the Board had not formulated its recommendations, and (2) the functions of the Board are to administer the Act and to make recommendations to the government but not to enter the political arena to influence legislation. I have felt that this explanation was due Chairman Altmeyer.

SOME SIGNIFICANT AMENDMENTS OF THE SOCIAL SECURITY ACT

1. The original act provided that the Tax rate for old-age benefits be increased from 1% to $1\frac{1}{2}$ % of compensation on January 1, 1940. An amendment eliminated this provision so that the rate will remain 1% until 1943, when it is to be raised to 2%. After three more years the rate will be $2\frac{1}{2}$ %, and after December 31, 1948, the rate will be 3% from both employers and employees.

2. The beginning of payments of old-age and survivors benefits was advanced from January 1, 1942, to January 1, 1940.

3. In addition to the old-age annuities for workers, which are called "primary insurance benefits," the new law introduces features of great importance, the principal ones being as follows:

- A. A benefit to the wife of an annuitant if she is past the age of 65 and to children under the age of 16 (18 if in school). Each of these benefits is half the primary insurance benefit. If the annuitant dies, the widow's benefit is increased to three-fourths of the pensioner's benefit.

- B. Benefits to the children of an insured person who dies prior to attaining the age of 65 and to a widow on whom such children are dependent. The widow's benefit is three-fourths of the primary insurance benefit, and that of each child is one-half of this benefit.

In no case is the total of benefits with respect to a single worker to be more than twice the primary insurance benefit, or more than 80% of the annuitant's average compensation, or more than \$85 a month.

4. A new and complicated formula has come into force for determining the amount of the primary insurance benefit. This involves the average wage during the time since January, 1937, or since the insured could have come into covered employment. The first calculation is 40% of this average monthly wage up to \$50 per month. If the worker earned more than \$50 a month, 10% of the average wage in excess of \$50 per month is added. One per cent of these items is added for each year of covered employment. The sum of these three items forms what is known in the Act as the primary insurance benefit. As previously stated, this amount is taken as the basis for calculating old-age pensions for wives, widows and children.

5. I shall not attempt to say much on the subject of the changes in the costs of the social security plan or the methods of meeting these costs. Chairman Altmeyer has estimated that the disbursements of 1940 under the new law will be sixty-eight million dollars more than they would have been under the law of 1935 and that during the next fifteen years the costs of Social Security will probably be seven billion dollars greater because of the new legislation. Forty-four million persons now have Social Security account numbers. Legislators have doubtless reacted to last year's discussion in which was brought out the prospect of a forty-seven billion dollar reserve invested in government obligations. This necessarily meant that contributions to this amount were used for other purposes. Under the new legislation a "pay as you go" plan has been adopted. No one believes that the Social Security taxes will yield sufficient income to meet the costs of the amended plan. Both the Social Security Board and the Advisory Council on Social Security anticipate that the Federal Government will need ultimately to contribute towards the support of Social

Security. We may rest assured that additional legislation will be required to provide the necessary funds.

In closing this section of my report, I would like to make a few observations on the effect on the colleges of the changes in the law. First, two years earlier than was anticipated, we have the example of a government providing protection for the employees of covered industries. If the employees of the colleges are going to be dissatisfied because they are working in uncovered institutions, we shall soon become aware of this dissatisfaction. Second, the provisions for wives and children in the new legislation are sure to make employment in the covered employments more attractive. Husbands and fathers are concerned about what will happen to their families in case of death or permanent retirement. Third, the amendments of 1939 show clearly a tendency away from the idea of individual equity and toward that of meeting social needs through the benefits provided. As long as the relationship was more nearly that of an individual to his government, it was easier for the institutions of higher education to remain aloof, but the amendments make old-age insurance a matter of social cooperation and joint effort for the public good. Therefore, because of this change in emphasis, the non-profit organizations as the churches, the hospitals, the community chests, the colleges and universities, will find it more difficult to "pass by on the other side." Fourth, the colleges must realize that if they should be included in the operation of the Act, they would still need to supplement the retiring annuities for the teachers. The Teachers Insurance and Annuity Association and most of the large insurance companies which issue group annuity contracts are prepared to make equitably the necessary adjustments in case the colleges and universities come under the operation of the Act.

THE COMMITTEE'S RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE FUTURE

1. That the Association of American Colleges is definitely opposed to inclusion under the unemployment insurance provisions of the Social Security Act.

2. That the Association re-affirms its position in favor of inclusion under the old-age and survivors provisions, provided this action should not be interpreted as a weakening of its opposition to the inclusion under the unemployment insurance provisions.

3. That the Association approves the recommendation of the Secretary of the Treasury and the Advisory Council on Social Security to replace the word "tax" by the word "contribution" wherever the former is used in reference to the old-age and survivors insurance program in the Federal Insurance Contributions Act.

4. That the Association authorize the Committee to endeavor to raise a fund outside the colleges from which to defray the expenses incurred in assisting the colleges to frame retirement plans for both professional and non-professional staffs.

REPORT OF JOINT COMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON INSURANCE AND
ANNUITIES AND THE COMMISSION ON PUBLIC RELATIONS

The special committee composed of the Committee on Insurance and Annuities and the Commission on Public Relations make the following recommendations with respect to the report submitted yesterday by the chairman of the Committee on Insurance and Annuities:

- I. To approve recommendations 1 and 4 of the report of the Committee on Insurance and Annuities.
- II. To postpone action of recommendations 2 and 3 for one year and to instruct the Committee to continue its study of the questions involved but to make no commitment of the Association's position on the question of inclusion under the Social Security Act for old-age and survivors benefits.

THE OFFICIAL RECORDS

Minutes of the Twenty-Sixth Annual Meeting of the Association of American Colleges

JANUARY 11-12, 1940

BENJAMIN FRANKLIN HOTEL
PHILADELPHIA, PENNSYLVANIA

First Session

THE TWENTY-SIXTH ANNUAL MEETING of the Association of American Colleges was called to order by President Meta Glass, 10:00 A.M., Thursday, January 11, 1940, in the Crystal Ballroom of the Benjamin Franklin Hotel, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. There were in attendance the usual large number of delegates and visitors. The invocation was pronounced by Monsignor J. L. Sheridan, President of Mount Saint Mary's College, Emmitsburg, Maryland.

A brief welcome address was made by President Thomas S. Gates of the University of Pennsylvania.

President Glass announced the following committees:

Committee on Nominations: President John L. Seaton, Albion College, *Chairman*; President J. Edgar Park, Wheaton College; President Laurens H. Seelye, St. Lawrence University; President W. G. Leutner, Western Reserve University; and Dean Winslow S. Anderson, Rollins College.

Committee on Resolutions: President J. Caldwell Guilds, Columbia College, *Chairman*; President Conrad Bergendoff, Augustana College; President Philip C. King, Washburn College; President L. H. Hubbard, Texas State College for Women; and President F. W. Patterson, Acadia University.

Treasurer LeRoy E. Kimball gave the report of the financial operations of the year, which included the financial statements of the various projects being operated on grants from the Carnegie Corporation. He also presented the official audit and proposed budget for the year 1940. On vote of the Association, these reports were approved and the audit adopted. (See pages 91-94.)

Executive Director Snavelly presented the report of the Board

of Directors and the report of the Executive Director for 1939. The reports were ordered received and filed, and the recommendations therein contained were approved. (See pages 85-90.)

The reports of the business officers being concluded by 10:30 A.M., a symposium was held on "The Relations Between the Liberal Arts College, the Junior College, and the Professional School."

The liberal arts college was represented by President James P. Baxter, 3rd, President of Williams College. (See pages 56-63.)

The junior college was represented by President Byron S. Hollinshead of Scranton-Keystone Junior College, who is president this year of the American Association of Junior Colleges. (See pages 64-72.)

The professional school was represented by Doctor Willard C. Rappleye, Dean of the Faculty of Medicine, Columbia University, and President of the Advisory Council on Medical Education. (See pages 73-80.)

Second Session

At 12:30 P.M., two well-attended luncheons were held. Superintendent A. J. Stoddard of the Philadelphia Public Schools was the discussion leader for the luncheon held by the Commission on Teacher Education. The Honorable Henry S. Drinker, General Counsel, the University of Pennsylvania, who has been most generous in gifts to the Association's Circulating Library of Choral Music, was the discussion leader for the luncheon held by the Commission on the Arts.

Third Session

President Glass convened the Thursday afternoon session at 2:30 o'clock. The first business of the afternoon was her excellent presidential report. (See pages 81-84.)

Dean Herbert E. Hawkes of Columbia College gave his report of the Commission on School and College Relations of the Progressive Education Association. (See pages 95-98.)

For the Commission on Academic Freedom and Academic Tenure, President Henry M. Wriston made a supplementary statement (see pages 99-104) and moved the endorsement of the amended report on academic freedom and academic tenure, which

is published on pages 99-107. President William C. Dennis of Earlham College seconded the motion for endorsement and gave a supplementary statement which is to be found on pages 104-105. After some discussion of the report by President Samuel Wilson of Loyola University, President Constance Warren of Sarah Lawrence College, President W. G. Leutner of Western Reserve University, and President Laurens H. Seelye of St. Lawrence University, Chairman Glass put the motion, which was adopted.

Provost R. H. Fitzgerald of the University of Pittsburgh gave his report as Chairman of the Commission on the Arts. On motion, this report was ordered received and published. (See pages 108-109.)

President H. M. Gage of Coe College reported as Chairman of the Commission on Teacher Education. By vote of the Association, his report was received and the recommendations therein approved. (See pages 114-119.)

President Francis Pendleton Gaines of Washington and Lee University reported as Chairman of the Commission on Public Relations. On motion, his report was received and filed for publication. (See pages 110-113.)

For the Committee on Insurance and Annuities, Chairman W. E. Weld, President of Wells College, made the report with certain recommendations, including three recommendations concerning the relationship of the colleges to the Social Security Act. After discussion by President Herbert J. Burgstahler of Ohio Wesleyan University, President Francis Pendleton Gaines of Washington and Lee University, President John S. Nollen of Grinnell College, President Daniel L. Marsh of Boston University and President W. G. Leutner of Western Reserve University, it was voted that the report be referred for further consideration to a joint committee composed of the Committee on Insurance and Annuities and the Commission on Public Relations. On behalf of this joint committee, President Weld reported on Friday morning, January 12, recommending the adoption of No. 2 and No. 4 of the original recommendations of his committee and the laying on the table of the other two recommendations for consideration by the Association at its 1941 annual meeting. To this joint committee report the Association voted concurrence. (See pages 120-125.)

Fourth Session

At 7:00 P.M., the annual dinner was held in the Crystal Ballroom with President Glass presiding. The invocation was pronounced by Doctor Gould Wickey, Executive Secretary of the Council of Church Boards of Education.

Clarence K. Streit was the first speaker. His topic was "Union Now." (See pages 15-19.)

Doctor Stephen Duggan, Director of the Institute of International Education, was the other after-dinner speaker. His topic was "The War and the Campus." (See pages 20-24.)

FRIDAY, JANUARY 12

Fifth Session

Chairman Glass called the Association to order at 10:00 A.M., Friday, January 12.

The general topic of the Friday-morning session was "A Free College in a Free State."

President Charles E. Diehl of Southwestern spoke on "Religious Freedom." (See pages 25-38). "Freedom as Affected by Finances" was the subject of the address given by Financial Vice-President J. W. Lowes of Harvard University. (See pages 39-44.) "Freedom in Legislation" was the topic discussed by President Fred Corson of Dickinson College. (See pages 45-55.)

On motion of President J. C. Guilds of Columbia College, Chairman of the Committee on Resolutions, the following resolutions were adopted:

The Committee on Resolutions reports its delight in the progress and on-going of the Association. An all-time high has been reached in the matter of membership (555 institutions), in receipts by the Treasurer, and, we believe, in solid achievement along many lines. These accomplishments were not accidents but are due to the hard work and the wise guidance given the affairs of the Association by our Executive Director, Doctor Guy Snively; by the President of the Association, Doctor Meta Glass; and by members of the Board of Directors. The Association goes on record as expressing its deep and abiding appreciation of the services of these men and women.

A large and important part of the work of the Association is done between the annual meetings by the various commissions and committees. The reading of a very brief summary of their activi-

ties reveals the enormous amount of time spent and work done. Your committee takes pleasure in bringing again to your minds these commissions and their chairmen that the appreciation of the Association of their splendid service may become a part of the official record of this meeting: The Commission on Academic Freedom and Academic Tenure, Chairman Henry M. Wriston; the Commission on the Arts, Chairman R. H. Fitzgerald, with Mr. Eric T. Clarke, Director of the Arts Program; the Commission on Teacher Education, Chairman H. M. Gage; the Commission on Public Relations, Chairman Francis P. Gaines; the Committee on Insurance and Annuities, Chairman W. E. Weld.

We are greatly indebted to those who have appeared on the program of this meeting with messages at once informative, inspiring, challenging, baffling and humbling. The thanks of the Association is hereby tendered them; also for the splendid singing by the Glee Club of the University of Pennsylvania.

We note with great pleasure the presence of Dr. Robert L. Kelly. No meeting of the Association would be complete without him, and we hereby convey to him our love and esteem. We await with great interest the appearance of his book, "The American Colleges and the Social Order." It will be, we are sure, a real contribution to the history of higher education in America.

The management of the Benjamin Franklin Hotel is thanked for its courteous attention to the needs of the Association and the comfort of its members.

Doctor Richard Watson Cooper, secretary of our association at the time of its formation and one time president of Upper Iowa University, was presented by President Glass. Doctor Cooper, who is living in retirement near Philadelphia, spoke briefly of the early days of the Association and gave a cheerful prophecy for the future of the liberal arts college in America.

On motion of President John L. Seaton, Chairman of the Committee on Nominations, the following were elected officers and to membership in the various commissions and standing committees:

President: Edward V. Stanford, President of Villanova College.

Vice-President: Remsen D. Bird, President of Occidental College.

Treasurer: LeRoy E. Kimball, Comptroller, New York University.

Executive Director: Guy E. Snively.

Board of Directors: (Additional Members) Conrad Bergendoff, President of Augustana College; James B. Conant, President of Harvard University; Charles E. Diehl, President of Southwestern; Mildred H. McAfee, President of Wellesley College.

Commission on Academic Freedom and Academic Tenure: President W. P. Tolley, Allegheny College, *Chairman*; Chancellor S. P. Capen, The University

of Buffalo; President William C. Dennis, Earlham College; President Edward A. Fitzpatrick, Mount Mary College; President Meta Glass, Sweet Briar College; President E. J. Jaqua, Scripps College; President R. A. Kent, University of Louisville; Dean E. H. Kraus, University of Michigan; President Laurens H. Seelye, St. Lawrence University; Dean Carl A. Wittke, Oberlin College.

Commission on the Arts: R. H. Fitzgerald, Provost of University of Pittsburgh, *Chairman*; President T. J. Davies, Colorado College; President E. M. Gwathmey, Converse College; President D. M. Keezer, Reed College; President F. P. Keppel, The Carnegie Corporation; J. Fredrick Larson, Dartmouth College; Barclay Leathem, Western Reserve University; President J. H. Reynolds, Hendrix College; Dean Gilmore D. Clarke, United States Commission on Fine Arts; Agnes Rindge, Vassar College.

Commission on Teacher Education: President Harry M. Gage, Coe College, *Chairman*; President Lucia R. Briggs, Milwaukee-Downer College; Dean Margaret T. Corwin, New Jersey College for Women; President C. K. Edmunds, Pomona College; President Fred Engelhardt, University of New Hampshire; President Fred G. Holloway, Western Maryland College; President L. H. Hubbard, Texas State College for Women; President W. L. Lingle, Davidson College; President P. C. Nash, University of Toledo.

Commission on Public Relations: President Francis P. Gaines, Washington and Lee University, *Chairman*; Vice-President J. W. Lowes, Harvard University; Doctor George Johnson, The Catholic University of America; President Daniel L. Marsh, Boston University; President John L. Seaton, Albion College; President W. E. Weld, Wells College.

Joint Committee on Fraternities: President Dixon Ryan Fox, Union College, *Chairman*; President Thomas N. Barrows, Lawrence College; Comptroller LeRoy E. Kimball, New York University; President Alexander Ruthven, University of Michigan; President Henry M. Wriston, Brown University.

Committee on Insurance and Annuities: President W. E. Weld, Wells College, *Chairman*; President Charles A. Anderson, Tusculum College; Controller J. C. Christensen, University of Michigan; President C. H. Marvin, George Washington University; Dean Francis L. Meade, Niagara University; Vice-President Paul H. Musser, University of Pennsylvania; Rainard B. Robbins, Vice-President and Secretary of the Teachers Insurance and Annuity Association of America.

Committee on Publications: The President, *ex officio*, the Vice-President, *ex officio*, The Executive Director, *ex officio*.

Representatives on American Council on Education: Chancellor S. P. Capen, The University of Buffalo (one year); President Francis P. Gaines, Washington and Lee University (two years); President David A. Robertson, Goucher College (three years).

Sixth Session

At 12:30 P.M. was held the regular concluding luncheon session. There was an attendance larger than usual and as large

as the dinner meeting of the evening before. His Excellency, Doctor Hu Shih, Ambassador of the Chinese Republic, gave an excellent address on "The World War and the Future World Order." (See pages 6-14.)

Seventh Session

The final session of the Twenty-Sixth Annual Meeting was held in cooperation with the National Youth Administration, with its administrator, Aubrey Williams, as the chief speaker. This session was in the nature of a conference and a discussion on the operation and future possibilities of the National Youth Administration with respect to its connection with the member colleges. Quite a number of the college representatives present participated in the discussion, presided over by President Glass.

Respectfully submitted,

GUY E. SNAVELY

Executive Director

MEMBERS OF THE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN COLLEGES

OFFICERS AND MEMBERS OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS
FOR THE YEAR ENDING JANUARY, 1941

GUY E. SNAVELY

Executive Director

19 West 44th Street, New York City

President, EDWARD V. STANFORD, *President of Villanova College*
Vice-President, REMSEN D. BIRD, *President of Occidental College*
Treasurer, LEROY E. KIMBALL, *Comptroller of New York University*
Executive Director Emeritus, ROBERT L. KELLY, Claremont, California
CONRAD BERGENDOFF, *President of Augustana College*
JAMES B. CONANT, *President of Harvard University*
CHARLES E. DIEHL, *President of Southwestern*
MILDRED H. MCAFEE, *President of Wellesley College*

By order of the Association, in the case of universities the unit of membership is the university college of liberal arts. Unless otherwise indicated the name of the president or the chancellor is given in the column headed Executive Officer.

INSTITUTION	EXECUTIVE OFFICER
ALABAMA	
Alabama College, Montevallo.....	A. F. Harman
Alabama Polytechnic Institute, Auburn.....	L. N. Duncan
Birmingham-Southern College, Birmingham.....	R. R. Paty
Howard College, Birmingham.....	Harwell G. Davis
Huntingdon College, Montgomery.....	Hubert Searcy
Judson College, Marion.....	L. G. Cleverdon
Spring Hill College, Spring Hill.....	W. D. O'Leary
Talladega College, Talladega.....	B. G. Gallagher
Tuskegee Normal and Industrial Institute, Tuskegee Institute	Frederick D. Patterson
University of Alabama, University.....	Richard C. Foster

ARIZONA

University of Arizona, Tucson.....	Alfred Atkinson
------------------------------------	-----------------

ARKANSAS

Agricultural, Mechanical and Normal College, Pine Bluff.....	John B. Watson
Arkansas State College, Jonesboro.....	V. C. Kays
College of the Ozarks, Clarksville.....	Wiley Lin Hurie
Hendrix College, Conway.....	J. H. Reynolds

Ouachita College, Arkadelphia.....	James R. Grant
Philander Smith College, Little Rock.....	M. LaFayette Harris

CALIFORNIA

College of the Holy Names, Oakland.....	Sister Mary Austin, <i>Dean</i>
College of the Pacific, Stockton.....	Tully C. Knoles
Dominican College, San Rafael.....	Mother M. Raymond
Immaculate Heart College, Hollywood.....	Sister Mary Redempta
La Verne College, La Verne.....	C. Ernest Davis
Loyola University, Los Angeles.....	Charles A. McQuillan
Mills College, Mills College.....	Aurelia H. Reinhardt
Mount St. Mary's College, Los Angeles.....	Mother Dolorosa
Occidental College, Los Angeles.....	Remsen duBois Bird
Pomona College, Claremont Colleges, Claremont.....	Charles K. Edmunds
St. Mary's College, Oakland.....	Brother Albert
San Francisco College for Women, San Francisco.....	Mother M. Guerin
Scripps College, Claremont Colleges, Claremont.....	E. J. Jaqua
Stanford University, Stanford University.....	Ray Lyman Wilbur
University of Redlands, Redlands.....	Elam J. Anderson
University of San Francisco, San Francisco.....	Harold E. Ring
University of Southern California, Los Angeles.....	R. B. von KleinSmid
Whittier College, Whittier.....	W. O. Mendenhall

COLORADO

Colorado College, Colorado Springs.....	Thurston J. Davies
University of Denver, Denver.....	David S. Duncan

CONNECTICUT

Albertus Magnus College, New Haven.....	Sister M. Isabel
Connecticut College for Women, New London.....	Katharine Blunt
St. Joseph College, West Hartford.....	Mother Maria Francis
Trinity College, Hartford.....	Remsen B. Ogilby
University of Connecticut, Storrs.....	Albert N. Jorgensen
Wesleyan University, Middletown.....	James L. McConaughy
Yale University, New Haven.....	Charles Seymour

DELAWARE

University of Delaware, Newark.....	Walter Hullihen
-------------------------------------	-----------------

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

American University, Washington.....	Joseph M. M. Gray
Catholic University of America, Washington.....	Joseph M. Corrigan
George Washington University, Washington.....	C. H. Marvin
Georgetown University, Washington.....	Arthur A. O'Leary
Howard University, Washington.....	Mordecai W. Johnson

FLORIDA

Florida Agricultural and Mechanical College, Tallahassee.....	J. R. E. Lee
Florida-Southern College, Lakeland.....	Ludd M. Spivey
Florida State College for Women, Tallahassee.....	Edward Conradi
John B. Stetson University, De Land.....	W. S. Allen
Rollins College, Winter Park.....	Hamilton Holt
University of Florida, Gainesville.....	John J. Tigert
University of Miami, Coral Gables.....	Bowman F. Ashe

GEORGIA

Agnes Scott College, Decatur.....	James R. McCain
Atlanta University, Atlanta.....	Rufus E. Clement
Berry College, Mount Berry.....	G. Leland Green
Bessie Tift College, Forsyth.....	C. L. McGinty
Brenau College, Gainesville.....	H. J. Pearce
Clark University, Atlanta.....	M. S. Davage
Emory University, Emory University.....	Harvey W. Cox
Georgia State College for Women, Milledgeville.....	Guy H. Wells
Georgia State Woman's College, Valdosta.....	Frank R. Reade
Mercer University, Macon.....	Spright Dowell
Morehouse College, Atlanta.....	Chas. D. Hubert, <i>Acting</i>
Morris Brown College, Atlanta.....	Wm. A. Fountain, Jr.
Paine College, Augusta.....	E. C. Peters
Piedmont College, Demorest.....	Malcolm B. Dana
Shorter College, Rome.....	Paul M. Cousins
Spelman College, Atlanta.....	Florence M. Read
University of Georgia, Athens.....	Harmon W. Caldwell
Wesleyan College, Macon.....	Dice R. Anderson

IDAHO

College of Idaho, Caldwell.....	William Webster Hall, Jr.
Northwest Nazarene College, Nampa.....	Russell V. DeLong

ILLINOIS

Augustana College, Rock Island.....	Conrad Bergendoff
Aurora College, Aurora.....	Theodore Pierson Stephens
Barat College of the Sacred Heart, Lake Forest.....	Mother Reilly
Bradley Polytechnic Institute, Peoria.....	F. R. Hamilton
Carthage College, Carthage.....	Rudolph G. Schulz, Jr.
Central Y. M. C. A. College, Chicago.....	Edward J. Sparling
College of St. Francis, Joliet.....	Mother M. Thomasine
De Paul University, Chicago.....	Michael J. O'Connell
Elmhurst College, Elmhurst.....	Timothy Lehmann
Eureka College, Eureka.....	Burris Dickinson, <i>Acting</i>
George Williams College, Chicago.....	Harold C. Coffman

Greenville College, Greenville.....	Henry J. Long
Illinois College, Jacksonville.....	H. Gary Hudson
Illinois Wesleyan University, Bloomington.....	W. E. Shaw
James Millikin University, Decatur.....	John C. Hessler
Knox College, Galesburg.....	Carter Davidson
Lake Forest College, Lake Forest.....	Herbert M. Moore
Loyola University, Chicago.....	Samuel K. Wilson
McKendree College, Lebanon.....	Clark R. Yost
MacMurray College, Jacksonville.....	Clarence P. McClelland
Monmouth College, Monmouth.....	J. H. Grier
Mundelein College, Chicago.....	Sister Mary Justitia
North Central College, Naperville.....	E. E. Rall
Northwestern University, Evanston.....	Franklyn Bliss Snyder
Rockford College, Rockford.....	Mary Ashby Cheek
Rosary College, River Forest.....	Sister M. Evelyn
St. Xavier College, Chicago.....	Sister Mary Genevieve Crane
Shurtleff College, Alton.....	Guy Wimmer
The Principia, Elmhurst.....	F. E. Morgan
University of Chicago, Chicago.....	A. J. Brumbaugh, <i>Dean</i>
University of Illinois, Urbana.....	M. T. McClure, <i>Dean</i>
Wheaton College, Wheaton.....	V. R. Edman, <i>Acting</i>

INDIANA

Butler University, Indianapolis.....	Daniel Sommer Robinson
DePauw University, Greencastle.....	Clyde E. Wildman
Earlham College, Richmond.....	William C. Dennis
Evansville College, Evansville.....	F. Marion Smith
Franklin College, Franklin.....	Wm. G. Spencer
Goshen College, Goshen.....	S. C. Yoder
Hanover College, Hanover.....	Albert G. Parker, Jr.
Indiana Central College, Indianapolis.....	I. J. Good
Indiana University, Bloomington.....	Herman B. Wells
Manchester College, North Manchester.....	Otho Winger
Rose Polytechnic Institute, Terre Haute.....	Donald B. Prentice
St. Mary's College, Notre Dame.....	Sister M. Madeleva
St. Mary-of-the-Woods College, St. Mary-of-the-Woods.....	Mother Mary Raphael
University of Notre Dame, Notre Dame.....	J. Hugh O'Donnell, <i>Acting</i>

IOWA

Central College, Pella.....	Irwin J. Lubbers
Clarke College, Dubuque.....	Sister Mary Antonia Durkin
Coe College, Cedar Rapids.....	Harry M. Gage
Cornell College, Mt. Vernon.....	John B. Magee
Drake University, Des Moines.....	Donald W. Morehouse
Grinnell College, Grinnell.....	John S. Nollen
Iowa Wesleyan College, Mt. Pleasant.....	Stanley B. Niles

Loras College, Dubuque	M. J. Martin
Luther College, Decorah	O. J. H. Preus
Morningside College, Sioux City	Earl A. Roadman
Parsons College, Fairfield	Donald L. Hibbard
St. Ambrose College, Davenport	Carl H. Meinberg
Simpson College, Indianola	John O. Gross
State University of Iowa, Iowa City	Eugene A. Gilmore
University of Dubuque, Dubuque	Dale D. Welch
Upper Iowa University, Fayette	Vivian T. Smith
William Penn College, Oskaloosa	Henry E. McGrew

KANSAS

Baker University, Baldwin City	Nelson P. Horn
Bethel College, North Newton	Ed. G. Kaufman
College of Emporia, Emporia	Dudley Doolittle
Friends University, Wichita	W. A. Young, <i>Acting</i>
Kansas Wesleyan University, Salina	Edgar K. Morrow
McPherson College, McPherson	V. F. Schwalm
Marymount College, Salina	Mother Rose Waller
Mount St. Scholastica College, Atchison	Mother Lucy Dooley
Municipal University of Wichita, Wichita	W. M. Jardine
Ottawa University, Ottawa	Andrew B. Martin
Saint Mary College, Leavenworth	A. M. Murphy
Southwestern College, Winfield	Frank E. Mossman
Sterling College, Sterling	H. A. Kelsey
Washburn College, Topeka	Philip C. King

KENTUCKY

Asbury College, Wilmore	H. C. Morrison
Berea College, Berea	Francis Stephenson Hutchins
Centre College, Danville	Robt. L. McLeod, Jr.
Georgetown College, Georgetown	Henry N. Sherwood
Kentucky State Industrial College, Frankfort	R. B. Atwood
Nazareth College, Louisville	Sister M. Anastasia Coady
Transylvania College, Lexington	Raymond F. McLain
Union College, Barbourville	Conway Boatman
University of Kentucky, Lexington	Frank L. McVey
University of Louisville, Louisville	R. A. Kent

LOUISIANA

Centenary College of Louisiana, Shreveport	Pierce Cline
Dillard University, New Orleans	Wm. S. Nelson
H. Sophie Newcomb College, New Orleans	Frederick Hard, <i>Dean</i>
Louisiana Polytechnic Institute, Ruston	E. S. Richardson
Louisiana State University, University	Paul M. Hebert, <i>Acting</i>
Loyola University, New Orleans	Percy A. Roy

Southwestern Louisiana Institute, Lafayette.....	L. E. Frazar
Tulane University, New Orleans.....	R. C. Harris
Xavier University, New Orleans.....	Mother M. Agatha

MAINE

Bates College, Lewiston.....	Clifton D. Gray
Bowdoin College, Brunswick.....	Kenneth C. M. Sills
Colby College, Waterville.....	Franklin W. Johnson
University of Maine, Orono.....	Arthur A. Hauck

MARYLAND

College of Notre Dame of Maryland, Baltimore.....	Sister Mary Frances
Goucher College, Baltimore.....	David A. Robertson
Hood College, Frederick.....	Henry I. Stahr
Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore.....	Isaiah Bowman
Loyola College, Baltimore.....	Edward B. Bunn
Morgan State College, Baltimore.....	D. O. W. Holmes
Mount St. Mary's College, Emmitsburg.....	J. L. Sheridan
St. John's College, Annapolis.....	Stringfellow Barr
St. Joseph's College, Emmitsburg.....	Sister Paula Dunn
University of Maryland, College Park.....	H. C. Byrd
Washington College, Chestertown.....	Gilbert W. Mead
Western Maryland College, Westminster.....	Fred G. Holloway

MASSACHUSETTS

American International College, Springfield.....	Chester S. McGown
Amherst College, Amherst.....	Stanley King
Boston College, Chestnut Hill.....	William J. Murphy
Boston University, Boston.....	Daniel L. Marsh
Clark University, Worcester.....	Wallace W. Atwood
College of Our Lady of the Elms, Chicopee.....	John R. Rooney, <i>Vice-Pres.</i>
Emmanuel College, Boston.....	Sister Julie
Harvard University, Cambridge.....	James B. Conant
Holy Cross College, Worcester.....	Joseph R. N. Maxwell
Massachusetts State College, Amherst.....	Hugh P. Baker
Mount Holyoke College, South Hadley.....	Roswell G. Ham
Regis College, Weston.....	Sister Genevieve Marie
Simmons College, Boston.....	Bancroft Beatley
Smith College, Northampton.....	Herbert J. Davis
Springfield College, Springfield.....	Ernest M. Best
Tufts College, Tufts College.....	Leonard Carmichael
Wellesley College, Wellesley.....	Mildred H. McAfee
Wheaton College, Norton.....	J. Edgar Park
Williams College, Williamstown.....	James P. Baxter, 3rd
Worcester Polytechnic Institute, Worcester.....	Watt Tyler Cluverius

MICHIGAN

Adrian College, Adrian.....	Harlan L. Feeman
Albion College, Albion.....	John L. Seaton
Alma College, Alma.....	John Wirt Dunning
Emmanuel Missionary College, Berrien Springs.....	H. J. Klooster
Hillsdale College, Hillsdale.....	Willfred Mauck
Hope College, Holland.....	Wynand Wichers
Kalamazoo College, Kalamazoo.....	Paul L. Thompson
Marygrove College, Detroit.....	Sister M. Honora
Michigan State College of Agriculture and Applied Science, East Lansing.....	Robert S. Shaw
Nazareth College, Nazareth.....	Sister Mary Celestine
Olivet College, Olivet.....	Joseph H. Brewer
Siena Heights College, Adrian.....	Mother M. Gerald
University of Detroit, Detroit.....	Charles H. Cloud
University of Michigan, Ann Arbor.....	Edward H. Kraus, <i>Dean</i>
Wayne University, Detroit.....	Frank Cody

MINNESOTA

Augsburg College, Minneapolis.....	Bernhard Christensen
Carleton College, Northfield.....	D. J. Cowling
College of St. Benedict, St. Joseph.....	Sister Claire, <i>Dean</i>
College of St. Catherine, St. Paul.....	Sister Eucharista
College of St. Scholastica, Duluth.....	Mother M. Agnes Somers
College of St. Teresa, Winona.....	Sister Mary A. Molloy
College of St. Thomas, St. Paul.....	James H. Moynihan
Concordia College, Moorhead.....	J. N. Brown
Gustavus Adolphus College, St. Peter.....	O. J. Johnson
Hamline University, St. Paul.....	Charles N. Pace
Macalester College, St. Paul.....	Charles J. Turck
St. Mary's College, Winona.....	Brother Leopold
St. Olaf College, Northfield.....	L. W. Boe
University of Minnesota, Minneapolis.....	John T. Tate, <i>Dean</i>

MISSISSIPPI

Belhaven College, Jackson.....	G. T. Gillespie
Blue Mountain College, Blue Mountain.....	Lawrence T. Lowrey
Millsaps College, Jackson.....	Marion L. Smith
Mississippi College, Clinton.....	D. M. Nelson
Mississippi State College, State College.....	G. D. Humphrey
Mississippi State College for Women, Columbus.....	B. L. Parkinson
University of Mississippi, University.....	A. B. Butts

MISSOURI

Central College, Fayette.....	Robert H. Ruff
Culver-Stockton College, Canton.....	W. H. McDonald

Drury College, Springfield.....	T. W. Nadal
Fontbonne College, St. Louis.....	Mother Joseph Aloysius
Lindenwood College, St. Charles.....	John L. Roemer
Maryville College, St. Louis.....	Mother Marie-Odéide Mouton
Missouri Valley College, Marshall.....	Thos. W. Bibb
Park College, Parkville.....	William L. Young
Rockhurst College, Kansas City.....	Daniel H. Conway
St. Louis University, St. Louis.....	Harry B. Crimmins
University of Missouri, Columbia.....	F. M. Tisdell, <i>Dean</i>
Washington University, St. Louis.....	George R. Throop
Webster College, Webster Groves.....	George F. Donovan
Westminster College, Fulton.....	Franc L. McCluer
William Jewell College, Liberty.....	John F. Herget

MONTANA

Carroll College, Helena.....	Emmet J. Riley
------------------------------	----------------

NEBRASKA

Creighton University, Omaha.....	J. P. Zuercher
Doane College, Crete.....	Bryan S. Stoffer
Duchesne College, Omaha.....	Mother Eleanor Regan
Hastings College, Hastings.....	John W. Creighton
Nebraska Wesleyan University, Lincoln.....	B. F. Schwartz
Union College, Lincoln.....	A. H. Rulkoetter
University of Nebraska, Lincoln.....	C. S. Boucher
York College, York.....	J. R. Overmiller

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Dartmouth College, Hanover.....	Ernest M. Hopkins
St. Anselm's College, Manchester.....	Bertrand C. Dolan
University of New Hampshire, Durham.....	Fred Engelhardt

NEW JERSEY

Brothers College, Drew University, Madison.....	Arlo A. Brown
College of St. Elizabeth, Convent Station.....	Sister Marie José Byrne, <i>Dean</i>
Georgian Court College, Lakewood.....	Mother M. Cecelia Scully
New Jersey College for Women, Rutgers University, New Brunswick.....	Margaret T. Corwin, <i>Dean</i>
Princeton University, Princeton.....	Harold W. Dodds
Rutgers University, New Brunswick.....	Robert C. Clothier
St. Peter's College, Jersey City.....	Dennis J. Comey
Seton Hall College, South Orange.....	James F. Kelley
Upsala College, East Orange.....	Evald B. Lawson

NEW MEXICO

University of New Mexico, Albuquerque.....	J. F. Zimmerman
--	-----------------

NEW YORK

Adelphi College, Garden City.....	Paul D. Eddy
Alfred University, Alfred.....	J. Nelson Norwood
Bard College, Columbia University, Annandale-on-Hudson	Charles Harold Gray, <i>Dean</i>
Barnard College, Columbia University, New York	Virginia C. Gildersleeve, <i>Dean</i>
Brooklyn College, Brooklyn.....	Harry David Gideonse
Canisius College, Buffalo.....	Francis J. O'Malley
Clarkson College of Technology, Potsdam.....	James Shelby Thomas
Colgate University, Hamilton.....	George B. Cutten
College of the City of New York, New York.....	Nelson P. Mead, <i>Acting</i>
College of Mt. St. Vincent, New York.....	Sister Catherine Marie, <i>Dean</i>
College of New Rochelle, New Rochelle.....	Francis W. Walsh
College of St. Rose, Albany.....	Sister M. Rosina, <i>Dean</i>
Columbia College, Columbia University, New York.....	Herbert E. Hawkes, <i>Dean</i>
Cornell University, Ithaca.....	Robert M. Ogden, <i>Dean</i>
D'Youville College, Buffalo.....	Sister Grace of the Sacred Heart
Elmira College, Elmira.....	Wm. S. A. Pott
Fordham University, New York.....	Robert I. Gannon
Good Counsel College, White Plains.....	Mother M. Aloysia
Hamilton College, Clinton.....	Wm. H. Cowley
Hartwick College, Oneonta.....	Henry J. Arnold
Hobart College, Geneva.....	Wm. Alfred Eddy
Houghton College, Houghton.....	Stephen W. Paine
Hunter College, New York.....	George N. Shuster, <i>Acting</i>
Keuka College, Keuka Park.....	J. Hillis Miller
Manhattan College, New York.....	Brother Victor
Manhattanville College of the Sacred Heart, New York	Mother Grace C. Dammann
Marymount College, Tarrytown-on-Hudson.....	Mother M. Gerard
Nazareth College, Rochester.....	Sister Teresa Marie, <i>Dean</i>
New York University, New York.....	Marshall S. Brown, <i>Dean</i>
Niagara University, Niagara Falls.....	Joseph M. Noonan
Queens College, Flushing.....	Paul Klapper
Russell Sage College, Troy.....	J. L. Meader
Saint Bonaventure College, Saint Bonaventure.....	Thomas Plassman
St. John's University, Brooklyn.....	Edward J. Walsh
St. Joseph's College for Women, Brooklyn.....	William T. Dillon, <i>Dean</i>
St. Lawrence University, Canton.....	Laurens H. Seelye
Sarah Lawrence College, Bronxville.....	Constance Warren
Skidmore College, Saratoga Springs.....	Henry T. Moore
Syracuse University, Syracuse.....	W. P. Graham
Union College, Schenectady.....	Dixon Ryan Fox
United States Military Academy, West Point.....	Jay L. Benedict
University of Buffalo, Buffalo.....	Samuel P. Capen

University of Rochester, Rochester.....	Alan C. Valentine
Vassar College, Poughkeepsie.....	Henry N. MacCracken
Wagner College, Staten Island.....	Clarence C. Stoughton
Wells College, Aurora.....	William E. Weld
Yeshiva College, New York.....	Bernard Revel

NORTH CAROLINA

Agricultural and Technical College, Greensboro.....	F. D. Bluford
Bennett College, Greensboro.....	David D. Jones
Catawba College, Salisbury.....	Howard R. Omwake
Davidson College, Davidson.....	Walter L. Lingle
Duke University, Durham.....	W. P. Few
Elon College, Elon College.....	L. E. Smith
Flora Macdonald College, Red Springs.....	Henry G. Bedinger
Greensboro College, Greensboro.....	Luther L. Gobbel
Guilford College, Guilford College.....	Clyde A. Milner
High Point College, High Point.....	Gideon I. Humphreys
Johnson C. Smith University, Charlotte.....	H. L. McCrorey
Lenoir Rhyne College, Hickory.....	P. E. Monroe
Livingstone College, Salisbury.....	W. J. Trent
Meredith College, Raleigh.....	Carlyle Campbell
North Carolina College for Negroes, Durham.....	James E. Shepard
Salem College, Winston-Salem.....	H. E. Rondthaler
Shaw University, Raleigh.....	Robert P. Daniel
University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill.....	Frank P. Graham
Wake Forest College, Wake Forest.....	Thurmin D. Kitchin

NORTH DAKOTA

Jamestown College, Jamestown.....	B. H. Kroeze
-----------------------------------	--------------

OHIO

Antioch College, Yellow Springs.....	A. D. Henderson
Ashland College, Ashland.....	Edward G. Mason
Baldwin-Wallace College, Berea.....	Louis C. Wright
Bluffton College, Bluffton.....	Lloyd L. Ramseyer
Capital University, Columbus.....	Otto Mees
College of Mount St. Joseph, Mount St. Joseph.....	Sister Maria Corona, <i>Dean</i>
College of Wooster, Wooster.....	C. F. Wishart
Defiance College, Defiance.....	John W. Claxton
Denison University, Granville.....	A. A. Shaw
Findlay College, Findlay.....	Homer B. Dunathan
Heidelberg College, Tiffin.....	Clarence E. Josephson
Hiram College, Hiram.....	Kenneth I. Brown
John Carroll University, Cleveland.....	E. C. Horne
Kent State University, Kent.....	Karl C. Leebrick
Kenyon College, Gambier.....	Gordon Keith Chalmers

Lake Erie College, Painesville.....	Vivian B. Small
Marietta College, Marietta.....	Harry Kelso Eversull
Mary Manse College, Toledo.....	Sister M. Catherine Raynor
Mount Union College, Alliance.....	Chas. B. Ketcham
Muskingum College, New Concord.....	Robert N. Montgomery
Notre Dame College, South Euclid.....	Mother Mary Evarista
Oberlin College, Oberlin.....	Ernest H. Wilkins
Ohio Northern University, Ada.....	Robert Williams
Ohio Wesleyan University, Delaware.....	Herbert J. Burgstahler
Otterbein College, Westerville.....	J. Ruskin Howe
St. Mary of the Springs College, Columbus.....	Sister Mary Aloyse
University of Akron, Akron.....	H. E. Simmons
University of Cincinnati, Cincinnati.....	Raymond Walters
University of Toledo, Toledo.....	Philip C. Nash
Ursuline College, Cleveland.....	Mother M. Veronica
Western College, Oxford.....	Ralph K. Hickok
Western Reserve University, Cleveland.....	W. G. Leutner
Wilberforce University, Wilberforce.....	D. Ormonde Walker
Wilmington College, Wilmington.....	Walter L. Collins
Wittenberg College, Springfield.....	Rees E. Tulloss
Xavier University, Cincinnati.....	Dennis F. Burns

OKLAHOMA

Bethany-Peniel College, Bethany.....	A. K. Bracken
Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College, Stillwater.....	H. G. Bennett
Oklahoma City University, Oklahoma City.....	A. G. Williamson
Oklahoma College for Women, Chickasha.....	M. A. Nash
Phillips University, Enid.....	Eugene S. Briggs
University of Tulsa, Tulsa.....	C. I. Pontius

OREGON

Albany College, Portland.....	C. W. Greene
Linfield College, McMinnville.....	Wm. G. Everson
Pacific University, Forest Grove.....	John F. Dobbs
Reed College, Portland.....	Dexter M. Keezer
University of Portland, Portland.....	Michael J. Early
Willamette University, Salem.....	Bruce R. Baxter

PENNSYLVANIA

Albright College, Reading.....	Harry V. Masters
Allegheny College, Meadville.....	William P. Tolley
Beaver College, Jenkintown.....	Raymon M. Kistler
Bucknell University, Lewisburg.....	A. C. Marts
Cedar Crest College for Women, Allentown.....	William F. Curtis
College Misericordia, Dallas.....	Sister Mary Loretta McGill
College of Chestnut Hill, Chestnut Hill.....	Sister Maria Kostka, <i>Dean</i>

Dickinson College, Carlisle.....	Fred P. Corson
Drexel Institute of Technology, Philadelphia.....	Parke R. Kolbe
Duquesne University, Pittsburgh.....	Raymond V. Kirk
Elizabethtown College, Elizabethtown.....	R. W. Schlosser
Franklin and Marshall College, Lancaster.....	John A. Schaeffer
Geneva College, Beaver Falls.....	McLeod M. Pearce
Gettysburg College, Gettysburg.....	Henry W. A. Hanson
Grove City College, Grove City.....	Weir C. Ketter
Haverford College, Haverford.....	W. W. Comfort
Immaculata College, Immaculata.....	Francis J. Furey
Juniata College, Huntingdon.....	Charles C. Ellis
Lafayette College, Easton.....	William Mather Lewis
Lebanon Valley College, Annville.....	Clyde A. Lynch
Lehigh University, Bethlehem.....	Clement C. Williams
Lincoln University, Lincoln University.....	Walter L. Wright
Marywood College, Scranton.....	Mother M. Josepha
Mercyhurst College, Erie.....	Mother M. Borgia Egan, <i>Dean</i>
Moravian College, Bethlehem.....	William N. Schwarze
Moravian College for Women, Bethlehem.....	Edwin J. Heath
Mount Mercy College, Pittsburgh.....	Mother M. Irenaeus
Muhlenberg College, Allentown.....	Levering Tyson
Pennsylvania College for Women, Pittsburgh.....	Herbert L. Spencer
Pennsylvania State College, State College.....	R. D. Hetzel
Rosemont College, Rosemont.....	Mother Mary Cleophas
St. Francis College, Loretto.....	Edward P. M. Caraher
St. Joseph's College, Philadelphia.....	Thomas J. Love
St. Vincent College, Latrobe.....	Alfred Koch
Seton Hill College, Greensburg.....	James A. W. Reeves
Susquehanna University, Selinsgrove.....	G. Morris Smith
Swarthmore College, Swarthmore.....	Frank Aydelotte
Temple University, Philadelphia.....	Charles E. Beury
Thiel College, Greenville.....	Earl S. Rudisill
University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.....	Thomas S. Gates
University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh.....	John G. Bowman
University of Scranton, Scranton.....	Brother D. Edward
Ursinus College, Collegeville.....	Norman E. McClure
Villa Maria College, Erie.....	Mother M. Helena
Villanova College, Villanova.....	Edward V. Stanford
Washington and Jefferson College, Washington.....	Ralph C. Hutchison
Waynesburg College, Waynesburg.....	Paul R. Stewart
Westminster College, New Wilmington.....	Robert F. Galbreath
Wilson College, Chambersburg.....	Paul Swain Havens

PUERTO RICO

Polytechnic Institute of Puerto Rico, San German.....	Jarvis S. Morris
---	------------------

RHODE ISLAND

Brown University, Providence.....	Henry M. Wriston
Pembroke College, Brown University, Providence.....	Margaret S. Morriss, <i>Dean</i>
Providence College, Providence.....	John J. Dillon

SOUTH CAROLINA

Coker College, Hartsville.....	Charles S. Green
College of Charleston, Charleston.....	Harrison Randolph
Columbia College, Columbia.....	J. Caldwell Guilds
Converse College, Spartanburg.....	Edward M. Gwathmey
Erskine College, Due West.....	Robert C. Grier
Furman University, Greenville.....	John L. Plyler
Lander College, Greenwood.....	John W. Speake
Limestone College, Gaffney.....	R. C. Granberry
Newberry College, Newberry.....	James C. Kinard
Presbyterian College, Clinton.....	William P. Jacobs
State Agricultural and Mechanical College, Orangeburg.....	M. F. Whittaker
The Citadel, Charleston.....	C. P. Summerall
Winthrop College, Rock Hill.....	Shelton J. Phelps
Wofford College, Spartanburg.....	Henry N. Snyder

SOUTH DAKOTA

Augustana College, Sioux Falls.....	Clemens M. Granskou
Dakota Wesleyan University, Mitchell.....	Joseph H. Edge
Huron College, Huron.....	Milton Carsley Towner
Sioux Falls College, Sioux Falls.....	Warren P. Behan
Yankton College, Yankton.....	George W. Nash

TENNESSEE

Cumberland University, Lebanon.....	Ernest L. Stockton
Fisk University, Nashville.....	Thomas E. Jones
King College, Bristol.....	Thos. P. Johnston
Knoxville College, Knoxville.....	Samuel M. Laing
Lane College, Jackson.....	J. F. Lane
Lincoln Memorial University, Harrogate.....	S. W. McClelland
Maryville College, Maryville.....	Ralph W. Lloyd
Milligan College, Milligan.....	H. J. Derthick
Southwestern, Memphis.....	Charles E. Diehl
Tennessee College, Murfreesboro.....	Edward L. Atwood
Tusculum College, Greeneville.....	Charles A. Anderson
Union University, Jackson.....	John J. Hurt
University of Chattanooga, Chattanooga.....	Archie M. Palmer
University of the South, Sewanee.....	Alexander Guerry
University of Tennessee, Knoxville.....	James D. Hoskins
Vanderbilt University, Nashville.....	O. C. Carmichael

TEXAS

Abilene Christian College, Abilene.....	James F. Cox
Baylor University, Waco.....	Pat M. Neff
Hardin-Simmons University, Abilene.....	Jefferson D. Sandefer
Howard Payne College, Brownwood.....	Thomas H. Taylor
Incarinate Word College, San Antonio.....	Sister M. Columkille
Mary Hardin-Baylor College, Belton.....	Gordon G. Singleton
McMurry College, Abilene.....	Frank L. Turner
Our Lady of the Lake College, San Antonio.....	H. A. Constantineau
Rice Institute, Houston.....	E. O. Lovett
St. Edward's University, Austin.....	Patrick Haggerty
St. Mary's University of San Antonio, San Antonio.....	Walter F. Golatka
Southern Methodist University, Dallas.....	Umpfrey Lee
Southwestern University, Georgetown.....	J. W. Bergin
Texas Christian University, Fort Worth.....	E. M. Waits
Texas College, Tyler.....	D. R. Glass
Texas College of Arts and Industries, Kingsville.....	J. O. Loftin
Texas State College for Women, Denton.....	L. H. Hubbard
Texas Technological College, Lubbock.....	Clifford B. Jones
Texas Wesleyan College, Fort Worth.....	Law Sone
Trinity University, Waxahachie.....	Frank L. Wear
Wiley College, Marshall.....	M. W. Dogan

UTAH

Brigham Young University, Provo.....	F. S. Harris
University of Utah, Salt Lake City.....	George Thomas

VERMONT

Bennington College, Bennington.....	Robert D. Leigh
Middlebury College, Middlebury.....	Paul D. Moody
St. Michael's College, Winooski.....	Leon E. Gosselin
University of Vermont, Burlington.....	Guy W. Bailey

VIRGINIA

Bridgewater College, Bridgewater.....	Paul H. Bowman
College of William and Mary, Williamsburg.....	John S. Bryan
Emory and Henry College, Emory.....	J. N. Hillman
Hampden-Sydney College, Hampden-Sydney.....	Edgar Graham Gammon
Hampton Institute, Hampton.....	Arthur Howe
Hollins College, Hollins.....	Bessie C. Randolph
Lynchburg College, Lynchburg.....	R. B. Montgomery
Mary Baldwin College, Staunton.....	L. Wilson Jarman
Randolph-Macon College, Ashland.....	J. Earl Moreland
Randolph-Macon Woman's College, Lynchburg.....	Theodore H. Jack
Roanoke College, Salem.....	Charles J. Smith
Sweet Briar College, Sweet Briar.....	Meta Glass

University of Richmond, Richmond.....	F. W. Boatwright
University of Virginia, Charlottesville.....	John L. Newcomb
Virginia Military Institute, Lexington.....	Charles E. Kilbourne
Virginia Polytechnic Institute, Blacksburg.....	Julian A. Burruss
Virginia State College for Negroes, Ettrick.....	John M. Gandy
Virginia Union University, Richmond.....	William J. Clark
Washington and Lee University, Lexington.....	Francis P. Gaines

WASHINGTON

College of Puget Sound, Tacoma.....	Edward H. Todd
Gonzaga University, Spokane.....	Leo G. Robinson
Seattle Pacific College, Seattle.....	C. Hoyt Watson
Whitman College, Walla Walla.....	W. A. Bratton
Whitworth College, Spokane.....	Ward W. Sullivan

WEST VIRGINIA

Bethany College, Bethany.....	W. H. Cramblet
Davis and Elkins College, Elkins.....	Francis J. Brooke
Marshall College, Huntington.....	James E. Allen
Salem College, Salem.....	S. O. Bond
West Virginia State College, Institute.....	John W. Davis
West Virginia University, Morgantown.....	Chas. E. Lawall
West Virginia Wesleyan College, Buckhannon.....	Roy McCuskey

WISCONSIN

Beloit College, Beloit.....	Irving Maurer
Carroll College, Waukesha.....	G. T. Vander Lugt, <i>Dean</i>
Lawrence College, Appleton.....	Thomas N. Barrows
Milton College, Milton.....	J. G. Meyer
Milwaukee-Downer College, Milwaukee.....	Lucia R. Briggs
Mount Mary College, Milwaukee.....	Edward A. Fitzpatrick
Northland College, Ashland.....	J. D. Brownell
Ripon College, Ripon.....	Silas Evans

CANADA

Acadia University, Wolfville, Nova Scotia.....	F. W. Patterson
Mount Allison University, Sackville, New Brunswick.....	George J. Trueman
University of Western Ontario, London, Ontario.....	W. Sherwood Fox
Victoria University, Toronto, Ontario.....	E. W. Wallace

HONORARY MEMBERS

American Association for the Advancement of Science
 American Association of University Professors
 American Association of University Women
 American Council of Learned Societies

American Council on Education
Carnegie Corporation
Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching
Council of Church Boards of Education and its constituent Boards
General Education Board
Institute of International Education
Jesuit Educational Association
National Catholic Educational Association
Social Science Research Council
Southern Education Foundation
United States Office of Education

CONSTITUTION OF THE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN COLLEGES, INCORPORATED

ARTICLE I

PURPOSE

The purpose of the Association shall be the promotion of higher education in all its forms in the colleges of liberal arts and sciences which shall become members of this Association, and the prosecution of such plans as may make more efficient the institutions included in its membership.

ARTICLE II

NAME

The name of this Association shall be the "Association of American Colleges, Incorporated."

ARTICLE III

MEMBERSHIP

SECTION 1. The membership of the Association shall be composed of those colleges of liberal arts and sciences which may be duly elected to membership in the Association after recommendation by the Board of Directors.

SECTION 2. Honorary Membership.—The general secretaries of church boards of education and officials of educational foundations and other cooperating agencies may be elected to honorary membership.

ARTICLE IV

REPRESENTATION

Every institution recognized as a member of this Association shall be entitled to representation in each meeting of the Association by an accredited representative. Other members of the faculty or board of trustees of any institution belonging to this Association, the officers of church boards cooperating with such an institution, and the representatives of foundations and other cooperating agencies, shall be entitled to all the privileges of representatives except the right to vote. Each institution recognized as a member of the Association shall be entitled to one vote on any

question before the Association, the vote to be cast by its accredited representative.

ARTICLE V

FIELD OF OPERATION

SECTION 1. The territory in which the operations of the Association are principally to be conducted is the United States.

SECTION 2. The principal office of the Association shall be located in the City of New York, State of New York.

ARTICLE VI

OFFICERS

SECTION 1. The Association shall elect from its membership the following:

1. President
2. Vice-President
3. Executive Director
4. Treasurer

SECTION 2. The Executive Director shall be the executive officer of the Association and shall serve until his successor is duly elected. The other officers shall serve for one year or until their successors are duly elected. Election of officers shall be by ballot.

SECTION 3. The duties of the respective officers shall be those usually connected with said offices.

ARTICLE VII

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

SECTION 1. The Board of Directors shall consist of eight members, four of whom shall be elected by ballot by the Association, and the other four shall consist of the officers of the Association.

SECTION 2. The President of the Association shall be *ex officio* chairman of the Board of Directors.

SECTION 3. Except as provided by statute and as directed by the members of the Association, and subject to the Constitution and By-Laws, the Board of Directors shall have power to manage, operate and direct the affairs of the Association and fill all vacancies.

ARTICLE VIII

QUORUM

Representatives of twenty-five members of the Association shall be necessary to form a quorum for the transaction of business.

ARTICLE IX

BY-LAWS

The Association may enact By-Laws for its own government, not inconsistent with the provisions hereof and the certificate of incorporation.

ARTICLE X

AMENDMENTS

Amendments to the foregoing Constitution may be offered at any regular annual meeting, and shall be in writing, signed by the mover and two seconds. They shall then lie on the table until the next annual meeting, and shall require for their adoption the affirmative vote of two thirds of the members then present.

1. Applications for membership shall be made to the Board of Directors, which shall, after investigation of the standing of the institution, recommend to the Association.

2. The annual dues shall be fifty dollars (\$50.00) per member. Non-payment of dues for two successive years shall cause forfeiture of membership.

3. At least one meeting of the Association shall be held in the month of January of each calendar year. Special meetings may be called by the Board of Directors, provided that four-weeks' notice in writing be given each institution connected with the Association.

4. The place of the annual meeting of the Association shall be determined each year by the Board of Directors.

5. All expenditure of funds of the Association shall be authorized by resolution of the Association, or subject to later approval by the Association, by the Board of Directors.

6. The President shall appoint a Committee on Resolutions at the beginning of each annual meeting, to which shall be referred for consideration and recommendation all special resolutions offered by members of the Association.

7. The Executive Director shall mail three copies of all official bulletins to all institutions which are members of the Association. Additional copies, either for the institution or for any officer or faculty member, may be had at a special rate.

8. These By-Laws may be amended at any business session of the Association by two thirds vote, provided that notice of the proposed amendment has been presented at a previous session.

POLICY

In accordance with the action of the Association, the working policy of the Association is a policy of *inclusiveness and inter-helpfulness rather than of exclusiveness*.

FORMER PRESIDENTS

- 1915 President Robert L. Kelly, Earlham College; *Constitution adopted*
- 1915-16 President Robert L. Kelly, Earlham College
- 1916-17 President Henry Churchill King,* Oberlin College
- 1917-18 President John S. Nollen, Lake Forest College
- President Hill M. Bell,* Drake University, *Vice-President, pre-*
siding
- 1918-19 President Donald J. Cowling, Carleton College
- 1919-20 President William A. Shanklin,* Wesleyan University
- 1920-21 President Frederick C. Ferry, Hamilton College
- 1921-22 President Clark W. Chamberlain, Denison University
- 1922-23 President Charles A. Richmond, Union College
- President Samuel Plantz,* Lawrence College, *Vice-President, pre-*
siding
- 1923-24 President Harry M. Gage, Coe College
- 1924-25 Chancellor J. H. Kirkland,* Vanderbilt University
- 1925-26 President Frank Aydelotte, Swarthmore College
- 1926-27 Dean John R. Effinger,* University of Michigan
- 1927-28 President Lucia R. Briggs, Milwaukee-Downer College
- 1928-29 President Trevor Arnett, General Education Board
- 1929-30 President Guy E. Snively, Birmingham-Southern College
- 1930-31 Dean Luther P. Eisenhart, Princeton University
- 1931-32 President Ernest H. Wilkins, Oberlin College
- 1932-33 President Irving Maurer, Beloit College
- 1933-34 President Edmund D. Soper, Ohio Wesleyan University
- 1934-35 President William Mather Lewis, Lafayette College
- 1935-36 President Henry M. Wriston, Lawrence College
- 1936-37 President James R. McCain, Agnes Scott College
- 1937-38 President James L. McConaughy, Wesleyan University
- 1938-39 President John L. Seaton, Albion College
- 1939-40 President Meta Glass, Sweet Briar College

* Deceased.

EDITORIAL NOTES

THE MIDWESTERN PSYCHOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION will hold its annual meetings on May 3rd and 4th with the department of psychology at the University of Chicago. Professor F. C. Kingsbury is acting as local chairman of the meetings. The presidential address will be given by Professor J. P. Guilford of the University of Nebraska. In addition a full program of research papers and symposia is being scheduled by the program committee under Professor Fred McKinney of the University of Missouri. Psychologists and others in related fields are cordially invited to attend the meetings.

THE COMMISSION ON AMERICAN CITIZENSHIP'S president, the Rt. Rev. Joseph M. Corrigan, Rector of the Catholic University of America, has announced the appointments of Monsignor Francis J. Haas, Rev. Dr. George Johnson and Dr. Robert H. Connery, as members of the executive committee of the commission. He also announced the appointment of Dr. Connery as Director and of Miss Mary Synon as Editorial Consultant of the Commission.

EDUCATION FOR DEMOCRACY, published by the Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York, contains the proceedings of the Congress on Education for Democracy held at Teachers College, Columbia University, August 15, 16, 17, 1939. The themes of the general meetings were: Democracy and Its Challenge, Democracy in Other Lands, The Contribution of Religion to Education for Democracy, Present Educational Opportunities for Rural Youth in a Democracy, The Contribution of Higher Education and Adult Education to Democracy, Democracy at Work and Democracy Moves Forward. Seminars were held on the theme: Centers of Tension in Education for Democracy and a summary report of these sessions is printed here. The book concludes with an address by Dean William F. Russell of Teachers College entitled "Looking Forward" and a list of both delegates and sponsors.

ARCHIVES AND LIBRARIES is a little volume of papers presented at the 1939 conference of the American Library

Association representing the joint program of the committee on archives and libraries of the American Library Association, The Pacific Coast Members of the Society of American Archivists and The Historical Records Survey, edited by A. F. Kuhlman, and outlines the progress in the broad fields of public archives and historical manuscripts. It is published by the American Library Association in Chicago.

A DIVISION OF CULTURAL RELATIONS in the Department of State has been established, as announced in our last March BULLETIN, for the broad purpose of encouraging and strengthening cultural relations and intellectual cooperation between the United States and other countries. Although the program of the Division embraces nations in all parts of the world, the initial period is being devoted to the understanding and development of cultural exchange between the United States and other American republics. Since a treaty has been ratified providing for the exchange of one professor and two students for circulation from each of eleven countries, this whole enterprise should be of vital interest to all colleges and universities in this country. Representative of the work being done is the Conference on Inter-American Relations in the Field of Music held October 18 and 19 at the Library of Congress. Eric Clarke, Director of our Arts Program, attended this conference and reported that an enlightening and fruitful discussion was held concerning the opportunities for exchange of music students and professors. Such questions as, "What are the resources for inter-American exchange in the field of music?"; "How can wider knowledge of the music of the Americans be made available?"; "How can dissemination of musical compositions be facilitated in the United States and the other American republics?" were posed and considered at length. The importance of cultural understanding of folk and popular music of the Latin Americas and the motion pictures and other visual aids as a medium of musical exchange are typical of the specific problems brought under consideration.

THE FINANCIAL CONDITION OF COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES in the United States, according to a recent issue of *School and Society*, "improved last year over the year, 1937-38, according to a report prepared by Henry G. Badger and Frederick

J. Kelly for the U. S. Office of Education. Collections from students for educational purposes increased nearly 8 per cent; contributions from national, state and local governments increased nearly 1 per cent; private benefactions for current purposes increased 9 per cent, and revenue from sales and services increased 24 per cent. However, the income from endowment funds dropped 3 per cent. While in 1938-39 income from endowment funds reached almost to nine-tenths of the level of 1929-30, the latter year reached a peak which has not been equaled since."

THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF JUNIOR COLLEGES has received a grant of \$25,000 from the General Education Board, of New York City, to finance a series of exploratory studies in the general field of terminal education in the junior college. Approximately 500 accredited junior colleges are now found in the United States besides another hundred which are not yet thus recognized. About two-thirds of the 175,000 students enrolled in these institutions do not continue their formal education after leaving the junior college. The new study will be concerned particularly with courses and curricula of a semi-professional and cultural character designed to give this increasing body of young people greater economic competence and civic responsibility. There is increasing evidence that existing four-year colleges and universities are not organized adequately to meet the needs of a large part of this significant group. Immediate responsibility for the study will be vested in an executive committee consisting of Roscoe C. Ingalls, Chairman, Doak S. Campbell, and Byron S. Hollinshead. The Director of the study will be Walter Crosby Eells, Executive Secretary of the American Association of Junior Colleges, Washington, D. C.

MEDICAL EDUCATION IN THE UNITED STATES 1934-1939 is a survey prepared for the Council on Medical Education and Hospitals of the American Medical Association (Chicago) by Doctors Herman G. Weiskotten, Alphonse M. Schwitalla, William D. Cutter and Hamilton H. Anderson. It contains excellent statistical information concerning the almost complete revamping of medical education in the United States which has taken place under the guidance of the Council and the Association of American Medical Colleges during the years indicated. The volume will be

of incalculable value to all those who have any interest whatever in the present problems of medical education and especially in its future progress.

THE INSTITUTE OF INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION HANDBOOK FOR AMERICAN STUDENTS IN FRANCE (Twentieth Series, Bulletin No. 1) is a new and revised edition of a similar booklet published in 1926, written by Doctor Horatio S. Krans, Director of the Continental Division of the American University Union in Europe. It is an excellent guide for the American student looking forward to study in France, or, having just arrived in that country, "finds himself at once, so far as educational institutions are concerned, in a world of bewildering choice." "The present volume," writes Doctor Krans in his *Preface*, "aims to dissipate the student's bewilderment and to substitute for it a soluble problem of choice among the institutions that can meet his needs."

PHILOSOPHIC ABSTRACTS, edited by Dagobert D. Runes, is a new quarterly published at 884 Riverside Drive, New York City, the first issue of which is *Winter 1939-1940*. It has a long list of distinguished contributing editors from this country and abroad whose abstracts of recent philosophic books have the merit of being brief, informative and analytical. Articles pertaining to philosophy in current American and foreign periodicals are also conveniently listed. Teachers and students alike should find this new publication of real reference value.

THE AUTOBIOGRAPHY OF A COLLEGE is a very interesting and inspiring history of the great progress made in the past ten years by Mount Mary College, Milwaukee, Wisconsin. It is novel in its composition in that the authors include students and faculty as well as Dean Sister Mary Dominic and President Edward A. Fitzpatrick. The book has supplementary charts and tables and attractive illustrations. The most interesting feature is an evaluation of the curriculum by the president.

DOCTOR CHARLES C. McCracken, Director of the Department of Colleges of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, has just issued Parts II and III of "A Survey of Student Personnel Services in Fifty Colleges Affiliated with

the Board of Christian Education of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America." Part II has to do with Personnel Work with Students in College: Part III deals with the Relative Importance of Student Personnel Services. In making this survey Director McCracken was assisted by faculty members of the colleges concerned, as well as others. The brochure contains an unusually full and fine selected bibliography on the problem of the guidance and counseling of students. The study does not pretend to set a pattern of student personnel service but is intended rather to stimulate colleges to initiate or improve their respective programs. It shows a very wide range of practices and of judgments regarding values. It seems to be an important contribution in the field of college personnel work.

INSTITUTION-FACULTY RELATIONS IN THE COLLEGE OF INTEGRITY is the title of a recent book from the pen of Doctor Roy W. Bixler, formerly of the University of Chicago. In the study, Doctor Bixler appraises practices, policies and proposals pertaining to the recruiting, salary, tenure, retirement plans, and housing of faculty members; faculty participation in college administration; and stimulation of faculty growth.

A CENTENNIAL HISTORY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF LOUISVILLE has just been issued as one of the publications of the *American Guide Series*. The book is an interesting and well-written story of the life during the first hundred years of the Municipal University in Louisville. It is written by the Kentucky Writers' Project of the Federal Work Projects Administration. President R. A. Kent and his administrative officers and other faculty members have cooperated freely in the preparation of the book.

MANUAL OF TEACHERS COLLEGE ACCOUNTING, written by Edward V. Miles, Jr., Associate Professor of Economics and Business Manager of Southern Illinois State Normal University, has just been issued by the Financial Advisory Service of the American Council on Education. This volume is prepared primarily as a guide for business officers of teachers' colleges, but it will also be helpful to similar officers in liberal arts colleges and other institutions of higher education. It gives a brief review of fundamental principles of college accounting. It analyzes the

accounting system, establishes a chart of accounts, explains budgetary control, and then develops in detail an accounting system, bringing into the discussion all necessary records and forms. "The book presents a complete plan for coordinating the budget, the accounting system, and the financial statements." It should prove invaluable for new men in the field of college business management and as a reference book for all college officers.

THE AMERICAN CANON, the title of the stirring and eloquent baccalaureate address given by President Daniel L. Marsh of Boston University at its last commencement, preaches Americanism in a most effective manner for a very critical period of our history. The seven writings selected by President Marsh as the most significant expressions of the American spirit are: The Mayflower Compact, the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution of the United States, Washington's Farewell Address, the Star-Spangled Banner, Lincoln's Second Inaugural Address, Woodrow Wilson's "Road Away from Revolution."

TEACHING WITH BOOKS.—Students make little use of the college library because they don't have to; they make good grades, often superior ones, without recourse to the library collection. The library is often removed from the vital center of the work of teaching. Who is responsible for the lack of real educational effectiveness of the library? Primarily the college president who selects librarians and professors; they carry out the educational policies and aim at an effectiveness which he insists upon; also, the professor who doesn't study how to make books other than textbooks effective; also, the librarian, who lets himself be dominated by inherited and often antiquated patterns of library service. What are some of the ways by which enterprising colleges are really making use of their libraries? How large should a library be? Can the costs of library service be justified? These matters are dealt with pleasantly and lucidly in *Teaching with Books* by Harvie Branscomb, a report published jointly by the Association of American Colleges and the American Library Association. It will be widely discussed.

THE ASSOCIATION OF COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK, through a special committee of which President Edmund E. Day, of Cornell University,

is chairman, has undertaken an all-State project for the improvement of teacher preparation and in-service training. This has been inspired partly by the recent Regents' Inquiry and partly by new legislation requiring, from 1942 on, an additional year of preparation for teachers. The institutions, public and private, of the State are attacking the problem cooperatively. To be executive secretary and coordinator of the project, under the Committee, the Association has selected Dean Harold E. B. Speight, of Swarthmore College, who has agreed to take up the work on March 1.

THE GREETINGS AND FELICITATIONS of the Association go to the two members who have recently been made bishops in their church—President John F. O'Hara of the University of Notre Dame and President Joseph M. Corrigan of the Catholic University of America.

AMONG THE COLLEGES

ADELPHI COLLEGE is holding this Spring its second annual Lectureship in Education at the Adelphi auditorium, Garden City, Long Island. The general theme being discussed by nationally recognized leaders in education at Harvard, Yale, Columbia and New York Universities is "Teaching the American Way." The lectures, which commenced February 27th, are being held on consecutive Tuesday afternoons extending through April 2. The series is presented as a project of the Adelphi department of education, Dr. S. E. Frost, Jr., chairman.

ARMOUR INSTITUTE AND LEWIS INSTITUTE have made plans for consolidation next September. The new school will be named the Illinois Institute of Technology.

BENNETT COLLEGE announces receipt of \$80,000 toward the erection of a dormitory. President David Jones says that during the past five years one million and thirty thousand dollars has been contributed to the College for capital purposes.

BENNINGTON COLLEGE in Vermont has been given a grant of \$58,700 for two projects in the social sciences by the General Education Board of the Rockefeller Foundation. It was the second gift to the college by the board within five years. The first project under the new grant will be a study in the use of field work in the social science, and the second project will be a study of the junior division, or first and second years' curriculum. Bennington College has also just received \$50,000 from the Carnegie Corporation for the completion of the original building program of the College.

BUCKNELL UNIVERSITY announces a gift of \$150,000 from three of its Trustees toward the construction of a \$350,000 Library.

THE COLLEGE OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK formally dedicated as a social center for the students a three-story building at 294 Convent Avenue. It was presented to the House Plan Association of the college by Sam A. Lewisohn in memory of his father, Adolph Lewisohn.

CONNECTICUT COLLEGE has been given almost \$500,000 for buildings, equipment and other purposes in the college year 1938-39 and up to November 27, 1939. The new units dedicated during January, 1940, were Frederick Bill Hall, Frank Loomis Palmer Auditorium and Harkness Chapel.

HARVARD UNIVERSITY has received from Professor Oakes Ames, director of Harvard's botanical museum, his prize orchid herbarium of 57,000 specimens, one of the finest collections of its kind in the world. Besides the herbarium, containing specimens of almost all the 600-odd known genera of the orchid family, Professor Ames has given the University his library of more than 1,800 volumes and pamphlets about orchids, as well as \$68,000 to establish an endowed curatorship for the collection, which is to be known as the Orchid Herbarium of Oakes Ames. The herbarium represents more than forty-five years of scientific study and collecting by Professor Ames. The herbarium, now the clearing house for orchidological research in the Americas, is noted particularly for types from the Americas, Asia and Oceania.

HOFSTRA COLLEGE has been presented an endowment fund in excess of \$700,000 by Howard S. Brower, trustee of the estate of the late Mr. and Mrs. William S. Hofstra and also a trustee of the college. The new endowment cannot be used for campus improvements or additional buildings. Its interest increment must be used in support of the college and the establishment of scholarships.

LA VERNE COLLEGE, California, in December, 1939, ahead of schedule, paid off the remaining \$26,500 mortgage indebtedness on its main campus and buildings. This was made possible through the sale, for \$28,000 cash, of a forty acre farm in Orange County, California, given the college by Adam Wenger of Pasadena, California.

THE LIBERAL ARTS COLLEGES OF WESTERN PENNSYLVANIA are holding on March sixteenth their first Music Festival.

MASSACHUSETTS STATE COLLEGE at Amherst completed a thousand dollar scholarship fund contributed to the College by members of the class of '82.

SIMMONS COLLEGE School of English will offer this year a course in the techniques of radio. The course, conducted by experts in radio production, will be open to seniors who have studied journalism, will cover writing radio programs, plays and continuity and editing script. On the curriculum for the second semester is a new course in advertising. The basic School of English course—publishing—is devoted to the graphic arts, particularly the application of fundamentals of design to composition and display as used in magazines, advertising and book publishing.

THE UNIVERSITY OF DENVER has established a center for Latin-American studies in order to so combine the various fields of learning that a better understanding between the American nations may be forthcoming through better education. The Center is permanent and embraces such fields as the life, languages, arts, history, geography, archaeology, economics and present-day relationships of the nations south of the Rio Grande. Working in close cooperation are the departments of anthropology, art, economics, literature, history, international relations, political science and Romance languages. The directors of the new Center are Professor Benicia Batione, Spanish; Professor Ida Kruse McFarlane, English Literature; Doctor Alonzo May, Economics and Finance, and Doctor Robert Zingg, Anthropology. On the Advisory Committee are Doctor Herbert Bolton of the University of California and Miss Elizabeth Wallace, Professor Emeritus, University of Chicago.

THE UNIVERSITY OF DENVER'S Foundation for the Advancement of the Social Sciences of the University of Denver conducted an Institute on Latin American Relations from February 19 to 24, 1940, under the direction of Dr. Ben M. Cherrington, Chief of the Division of Cultural Relations in the Department of State. The personnel of leadership included the following: Doctor Enrique Lozada, Williams College, in the field of Latin American culture and history; Mrs. Concho Romero James, director of the Division of Intellectual Cooperation of the Pan-American Union; Mr. Hubert Herring, director of the Committee on Cultural Relations with Latin America and director of the Mexican Seminar; Mr. Frederico Bach, professor of Economics at the National University of Mexico and economic adviser to the present

government; and Dr. James King, student of Latin American affairs and specialist in the culture of Brazil.

THE UNIVERSITY OF WESTERN ONTARIO, London, has received from a citizen of London a forty thousand dollar astronomical observatory. Work has already begun on the project. The building will be known as the Hume Cronyn Memorial Observatory. Major Hume Cronyn when he was Member of Parliament for London some twenty-five years ago was responsible for the founding of the Canadian National Research Foundation.

VASSAR COLLEGE has received a gift of \$180,000 from Mr. and Mrs. Paul Mellon for the college's seventy-fifth anniversary fund. Mrs. Mellon is a graduate of Vassar in the class of '26. Vassar College has also received an anonymous gift of \$50,000 for a low-cost housing project for the faculty.

WASHBURN COLLEGE celebrated its Seventy-Fifth Anniversary on February 6, 1940. The speakers at the convocation exercises and at the radio broadcast program in the evening included ex-Governor Alfred M. Landon and Governor Payne H. Ratner of Kansas, Doctor Charles M. Sheldon of Topeka, the author of the famous book, "In His Steps" and Guy E. Snively, Executive Director of the Association of American Colleges. President Philip C. King is completing his tenth year as president of Washburn College, which has made great progress during his administration.

WASHINGTON COLLEGE has completed construction of two fine additional buildings. The Dunning Science Hall was dedicated on January 16, 1940, with President Isaiah Bowman of Johns Hopkins University and Executive Director Guy E. Snively as the speakers. Doctor Robert M. Lester, Secretary of the Carnegie Corporation of New York, gave the principal address at the dedication of the Bunting-Foxwell Library on February 24, 1940.

WESTERN COLLEGE announces that Mr. Edward Hidden of St. Louis has left in his will three-fourths of his residuary estate to the College and one-fourth to Yale University. The gift amounts to something over a quarter of a million dollars. Western College has also received a gift of \$50,000 to be used toward

a new science building and has been given by the same donor \$5,000 for student-aid. The citizens of Oxford recently raised nearly \$30,000 which will probably be used toward a new dormitory. The Alumnae are now raising money for the same purpose.

YALE UNIVERSITY has elected the chairman of the department of philosophy, Filmer S. C. Northrop, master of Silliman College, the tenth of Yale's undergraduate schools, which is now under construction.

THE SENATE OF PHI BETA KAPPA has voted approval to the recommendations of its committee on qualifications that chapters of Phi Beta Kappa be established at the following member colleges of the Association: Albion College, Michigan; Bucknell University, Lewisburg, Pennsylvania; Catholic University of America, Washington, D. C.; Elmira College, New York; Milwaukee-Downer College, Wisconsin; Wake Forest College, North Carolina; Wofford College, Spartanburg, South Carolina; and the University of Denver, Colorado.

WESLEYAN PRINT COLLECTION

LOANS AVAILABLE TO COLLEGES

THE Wesleyan Print Collection, one of the most extensive in this country, consists of representative examples from every important period in the history of prints, beginning with the fifteenth century and continuing to the present day. There are famous engravings by Albrecht Durer and Antonio Pollaiuolo; etchings by Rembrandt, Goya, Hogarth, Millet, Whistler, and Pennell; and by Muirhead Bone, James McBey, and David Cameron, to mention only a few of the most important artists. The Collection, which is valued at approximately a quarter of a million dollars, is the gift of George W. Davison of New York, President of the Wesleyan Board of Trustees, and is supplemented by prints given by John Taylor Arms, and others.

Prints from the Collection may be borrowed by educational institutions and museums. They are expected to provide the cost of transportation, packing and insurance; also glass and an experienced person to install the exhibition. In case the latter is not available the prints can be sent framed and ready for hanging.

The following is a list of suggested exhibitions; where several are planned for consecutive showing it is advisable to select one of the contemporary groups and subsequently one or more from the earlier periods:

Contemporary American and European Prints

Etchings by John Taylor Arms

Prints by Pennell and His Generation

Etchings and Lithographs by Joseph Pennell

Prints by Whistler and His Contemporaries (19th century)

French Prints of the Nineteenth Century

Etchings and Other Prints by Millet (19th century)

Lithographs by Daumier and Illustrations by Homer (19th century)

Goya's Etchings, "Disasters of War" (18th century)

Etchings by Rembrandt and His Contemporaries (17th century)

Engravings, Etchings, and Woodcuts of the Fifteenth and Sixteenth Centuries.

The total cost of insurance and packing varies with the size and nature of the exhibition: a group of fifty modern prints would cost not more than \$10; for one hundred prints by old masters it would be about \$25 to \$40 for a period of one month. If these are sent framed the cost of transportation is increased. The purpose of lending prints from the Collection is to stimulate interest in the subject in colleges and schools, and to allow students to enjoy original works of art which ordinarily can be seen only in certain museums and private collections. In addition, arrangements may be made for special lectures by the Curator on these and any other exhibition that might be desired. The value of showing in art courses prints by important painters need hardly be pointed out and other departments will also find material applicable to their special fields.

Address all correspondence to Gustave von Groschwitz, Curator of the Wesleyan Print Collection, Wesleyan Station, Middletown, Connecticut.

NEW COLLEGE PRESIDENTS

- Bard College, Columbia University, Annandale-on-Hudson.
Charles Harold Gray, head of the literature division of Bennington College, Vermont.
- Beaver College, Jenkintown, Pennsylvania. Raymon M. Kistler, pastor of the Central Presbyterian Church, Rochester, New York. (Effective July 1, 1940.)
- Cedarville College, Cedarville, Ohio. Walter Smith Kilpatrick, Presbyterian pastor. (Effective September, 1940).
- Central Normal College, Danville, Indiana. Virgil Hunt, acting president of the College and former president, Pikeville College, Kentucky.
- Colorado State College of Agriculture and Mechanic Arts, Fort Collins. Roy M. Green, general agent, Farm Credit Administration in Wichita, Kansas.
- Concordia Teachers College, River Forest, Illinois. A. W. Klinck.
- Duquesne University, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania. Raymond V. Kirk, dean and organizer of the University's school of education.
- Friends University, Wichita, Kansas. W. A. Young (acting), dean of the College.
- Hiram College, Hiram, Ohio. Paul Henry Fall, professor of chemistry, Williams College. (Effective June, 1940).
- Meredith College, Raleigh, North Carolina. Carlyle Campbell, former president of Coker College.
- Milton College, Milton, Wisconsin. J. G. Meyer, former president, Elizabethtown College, Pennsylvania.
- Mundelein College, Chicago, Illinois. Sister Mary Justitia.
- Northwestern State College, Alva, Oklahoma. Chester O. Newlun.
- Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio. Howard Landis Bevis, William Ziegler professor of government and law, Harvard University and former Ohio Supreme Court judge.
- Oregon State College, Corvallis, Oregon. Frank Lewelling Ballard. (Effective July 1, 1940).
- Rhode Island College of Education, Providence, Rhode Island.
Lucius A. Whipple, a former principal of the Pawtucket

(R. I.) High School and member of the staff of the state commissioner of education.

Rosemont College, Rosemont, Pennsylvania. Mother Mary Cleophas, vice-president of the College.

Silliman University, Philippine Islands. A. L. Carson, formerly a director of the Rural Institute, Chee Loo University, Tsinan, China.

Southeastern State College, Durant, Oklahoma. T. T. Montgomery.

Southwestern State Teachers College, Weatherford, Oklahoma. James B. Boren, formerly superintendent of the Mangum, Oklahoma, schools.

State Teachers College, Bloomsburg, Pennsylvania. Harvey A. Andruss (acting), Dean of Instruction and Registrar of the College.

State Teachers College, East Stroudsburg, Pennsylvania. Joseph F. Noonan, president, State Teachers College, Mansfield, Pennsylvania.

State Teachers College, Elizabeth City, North Carolina. Harold L. Trigg.

State Teachers College, Keene, New Hampshire. Floyd P. Young.

State Teachers College, Memphis, Tennessee. R. C. Jones, Dean.

State Teachers College, Worcester, Massachusetts. Clinton E. Carpenter, director of teacher training, State Teachers College, Fitchburg, Massachusetts.

University of Notre Dame, Indiana. J. Hugh O'Donnell (acting), vice-president of the University.

Wheaton College, Wheaton, Illinois. V. R. Edman (acting), head of the department of History.

ADDITIONS TO THE OFFICE LIBRARY

- ABSTRACTS OF DISSERTATIONS PRESENTED BY CANDIDATES FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY. Autumn Quarter, Winter Quarter 1938-39. The Ohio State University, Columbus. 1939. 279 p.
- ATKINSON, CARROLL. *Development of Radio Education Policies in American Public School Systems*. Edinboro Educational Press, Edinboro, Pennsylvania. 1939. 279 p. \$1.50.
- ATKINSON, CARROLL. *Education by Radio in American Schools*. George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville, Tennessee. 1938. 126 p.
- BIXLER, ROY W. *Institution-Faculty Relations in the College of Integrity*. Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York. 1939. 178 p. \$2.25.
- DOWLEN, LOUISE. *Landon Cabell Garland—The Prince of Southern Educators*. Bulletin of Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tennessee. Vol. XXXVIII, No. 2. January 15, 1938. 41 p.
- Education For Democracy*. The Proceedings of the Congress on Education for Democracy. Teachers College, Columbia University, August 15, 16, 17, 1939. Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York. 1939. 466 p. \$2.50.
- FITZPATRICK, EDWARD A. *The Autobiography of a College*. By the President, Faculty and Students of Mount Mary College, Milwaukee, Wisconsin. The Bruce Publishing Company, Milwaukee, Wisconsin. 1939. 271 p.
- GETMAN, FREDERICK H. *Ira Remsen—Erstwhile Dean of Baltimore Chemists*. Reprinted from Journal of Chemical Education, Vol. 16, No. 8. August, 1939. 24 p.
- GRUENBERG, BENJAMIN C. AND KAUKONEN, J. L. *High Schools and Sex Education*. Bulletin No. 75 revised. United States Public Health Service. Washington, D. C. 1939. 110 p. 20 cents.
- HEARD, GERALD. *A Quaker Mutation*. Pendle Hill Pamphlet. Number Seven. Pendle Hill, Wallingford, Pennsylvania. 49 p. 25 cents.
- HERRICK, CHEESMAN A. *Stephen Girard, Founder*. The Trade

- School, Girard College, Philadelphia. Fourth Edition. 1923. 203 p.
- Horace Mann After Fifty Years.* Horace Mann School for Boys, New York. 1937.
- JACKSON, DUGALD C. *Present Status and Trends of Engineering Education in the United States.* Engineers' Council for Professional Development. 29 West 39th Street, New York, N. Y.
- Kentucky Writers' Project of the Work Projects Administration. *A Centennial History of the University of Louisville.* American Guide Series. Sponsored by the University of Louisville, Louisville, Kentucky. 1939. 301 p.
- KNOTT, WIDNELL DIMSDALE. *The Influence of Tax-Leeway on Educational Adaptability.* Contributions to Education No. 785, Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York, N. Y. 1939. 84 p.
- KRAUS, HORATIO S. *The Institute of International Education.—Handbook for American Students in France.* New and Revised Edition. Twentieth Series. Bulletin No. 1. New York. July 1, 1939. 143 p. 25 cents.
- KUHLMAN, A. F., Editor. *Archives and Libraries.* American Library Association, Chicago. 1939. 108 p. \$1.75.
- LATHAM, ROBERT. *Improve Your Business Letters.* Bruce Humphries, Inc., Boston. 1939. 188 p.
- MCCRACKEN, CHARES C. (BROWNE, KENNETH ALTON AND MCCRACKEN, CHARLES WILLIAM, Collaborators.) *A Survey of Student Personnel Services in Fifty Colleges Affiliated with the Board of Christian Education of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America.* Part II Personnel Work with Students in College. Part III Relative Importance of Student Personnel Services. Selected Bibliography. 111 p. 50 cents, payable with order. Send orders to Charles C. McCracken, 822 Witherspoon Building, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.
- MARSH, DANIEL L. *The American Canon.* The Abingdon Press, New York. 126 p. \$1.00.
- MILES, JR., EDWARD V. *Manual of Teachers College Accounting.* American Council on Education, Washington, D. C. 1940. 190 p.
- RUSSELL, JOHN DALE, Compiler and Editor. *The Outlook for*

Higher Education. Vol. XI. Proceedings of the Institute for Administrative Officers of Higher Institutions, 1939. The University of Chicago Press, Chicago. 1939. 255 p. \$2.00.

WEISKOTTEN, HERMAN G., SCHWITALLA, ALPHONSE M., CUTTER, WILLIAM D. AND ANDERSON, HAMILTON H. *Medical Education in the United States 1934-1939*. Prepared for the Council on Medical Education and Hospitals of the American Medical Association. American Medical Association, Chicago. 1940. 259 p.

YARRILL, E. H., Translator. *Browning's 'Roman Murder Story' as Recorded in a Hitherto Unknown Italian Contemporary Manuscript*. Baylor University's Browning Interests Series 11. The Baylor Bulletin Vol. XLII No. 4, Baylor University, Waco, Texas. December, 1939. 47 p.